

# Library Publishing Curriculum

## Introduction Module

### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

#### **Introduction Module Authors (Library Publishing Curriculum Editorial Board)**

Cheryl E. Ball, Harrison W. Inefuku, Johanna Meetz, Joshua Neds-Fox, Reggie Raju, Celia Rosa, Chelcie Rowell, Kate Shuttleworth, John W. Warren, Sarah Wipperman

#### **Contributors**

Kathleen Fitzpatrick, Karen Lauritsen, Emma Vecellio

#### **Remixed content authors**

Carol Ann Borchert, Isaac Gilman, October Ivins, Katherine Skinner, Kevin Stranack, and Charles Watkinson

### INTRODUCTION

In 2018, The Educopia Institute and the Library Publishing Coalition (LPC), in partnership with the Public Knowledge Project (PKP), NASIG, and BlueSky to BluePrint, released the first iteration of the “Library Publishing Curriculum,” a suite of synchronous and asynchronous professional development offerings for librarians. The four initial modules—Content, Impact, Policy, and Sustainability—were funded by the Institute for Museum and Library Sciences and address major competencies in library publishing. As part of the sustainability plan for these grant deliverables, the LPC created an editorial board that would steer future iterations of the curriculum. They took as their first task a step back from the existing modules to provide an introduction that would frame the rest of the curriculum for complete newbies to library publishing. This Introduction Module offers an entry-level approach that explains the very fundamentals of library publishing that the discipline has inhabited over the last decade—explaining much of the implicit work of who, what, when, where, and why of library publishing.

### WHY LIBRARY PUBLISHING?

We begin the Introduction Module with a big-picture overview of why library publishing exists and how it operates. This section provides context for the subsequent sections in this Narrative. If you’re short on time, consider this section the Executive Summary of this module and seek details on the who, what, where, and when in the other sections.

#### **As an Extension of What Libraries Are Already Doing**

Libraries have always been in the business of curating, describing, and organizing content—including creating metadata; curating and making content discoverable via catalogs; and purchasing, leasing, and



disseminating content through subscriptions and purchases. Over the past several decades, academic libraries, as well as many public libraries, have extended their mission and strategic priorities into providing additional services for patrons and communities, including such activities as establishing and staffing centers that focus on research, digital humanities, digital scholarship, and data management. This extension of services underscores a fundamental shift as the academic library comes to be seen as the information and research commons of the 21st-century university.

Library publishing is an extension of these core services with the fundamental distinction that the library becomes a locus for the creation of content, as well as continuing to ensure that content can be accessed and disseminated. In traditional library models, content is typically only available to users who either have access to the physical library collection or to vendor-controlled digital collections. For vendor-controlled digital collections, libraries typically pay annual subscriptions to the vendors in order to ensure the university community has access or may pay for a certain number of “seats” (or number of people) who may access a certain resource at a time. This model can create issues with budget constraints, variability in pricing for content, uncertain access to collections in perpetuity, and restrictions as to how many people can access a collection at a certain time or who can have access, which may not include alumni, certain schools or centers, or research affiliates. Despite a marked increase in open-access content, meaning content “free-of-charge” to the reader, libraries are nevertheless commonly charged with subsidizing open-access publishers and providing funds to students and faculty who must pay to publish in these venues.

Library publishing models take a wide variety of forms, sizes, and missions, but a commonality is providing publishing services and training to students, faculty, staff, departments, and research centers within the university community (and frequently the surrounding community as well); creating content in a wide variety of disciplines and formats; and ensuring that the content is accessible not only to the local university but to researchers, scholars, students, and community members everywhere. Library publishers create, make, and disseminate content through their own means, which gives the university more control over the content and its future.

A core component of library publishing’s mission is also to create and disseminate content that may not be of interest to commercial publishers and to ensure that content is affordable to the community. An example of the former is the library publishing department’s role in facilitating student and faculty-led journals, providing journal-publishing services at no or low cost to the university; students and faculty, including voices that have traditionally been marginalized or underrepresented in traditional publishing, can generate professional-quality scholarly and literary journals that are accessible to a larger community. An example of the latter is the library publisher’s role in enabling and disseminating Open Educational Resources (OERs); in some universities the library operates in partnership, as a repository of OERs created elsewhere in the university and in other universities, while in many institutions the library publisher takes a direct role in funding, publishing, and disseminating OERs. Library publishing models are myriad and respond to the needs of specific universities.

## As a Strategy Against the Serials Crisis, Commercial Integration, and Transformative Agreements

The cost of serials has been an ongoing concern for libraries for decades. Journal subscriptions have been rising at a rate that exceeds the consumer price index (CPI), yet libraries have fairly flat budgets with little to no increases to accommodate these rising costs. The result is often cuts to other materials, such as books.

To respond to libraries' concerns around pricing, publishers created "Big Deal packages" which provide libraries with access to a larger number of journal titles for a reduced rate. These packages allow libraries to get dozens, or even hundreds, of additional titles for a fairly low rate, and provide a reduced price cap on the overall package. However, there is little room for negotiation or ability to swap out low-use for high-demand titles.

Additionally, smaller publishing companies have been bought out by larger ones, creating a situation where there are less than a half dozen large journal publishers. When this happens, the titles of those smaller publishers can increase up to 200% and libraries are locked into subscriptions at the new price. All of this can result in publishers having profit margins near 40%, with authors providing their research and peer reviewers the quality assurance for free.

With rising, above-inflation costs and "big deal" journal packages putting increasing pressure on material budgets, libraries became concerned about what they perceived as monopolistic practices among commercial and large society publishers. Could alternative dissemination channels break this stranglehold and put libraries in a better negotiating position? Library publishing aims to disrupt this model, though change at this scale can be difficult. Several early library publishing programs had large ambitions but fairly quickly realized that an individual institution's resources were not sufficient to challenge well-financed global behemoths.

Some universities have taken a stand by canceling their Big Deals and going public with the negotiations and prices. Some institutions are pushing back at commercial publishers to incorporate open-access models, as discussed in the following section. The Scholarly Publishing and Academic Resources Coalition (SPARC) has compiled a database of Big Deal Cancellations, which includes reasons why institutions are opting out (SPARC, n.d.).

## As a Radical Reimagining of the Process of Communicating Knowledge and Who Gets To Communicate That Knowledge

As discussed in the "What Role Does Open Access Play?" and "Where Are We Headed in (Library) Publishing?" sections later in this Introduction Module, the modern academic library has transformed itself from a curator of content to a producer and enabler of content, from journals and open monographs, to open educational resources and other forms of knowledge and scholarship. While this does not take away from the academic library's traditional role in providing and communicating information to undergraduate, graduate students, faculty, and staff about knowledge and scholarship, libraries are devoting at least a portion of their resources (including staff time) to support the creation

and dissemination of open-access works, for the benefit of the university as well as the global community.

In this effort, library staff as well as university stakeholders—including but not limited to undergraduates, graduate students, early-career and tenured faculty, and department and center administrators—are also learning about the production and dissemination of knowledge in ways that are beneficial to their careers.

Library publishing efforts also have the benefit of supporting underrepresented voices that have often been ignored or overlooked by traditional scholarly publishing, especially for-profit publishing models.

### As It Connects to the University's Mission

As discussed later in this Introduction Module and other modules of the Library Publishing Curriculum, library publishing models are responsive to the mission of the university and the role of the library as a whole as a research and community center. Library publishers frequently provide training and services that assist and enable undergraduate and graduate students, faculty members, departments and institutes, and local community members to create and disseminate content, at no-cost or limited cost to the users.

University missions, of course, vary widely, from private institutions to public institutions. However, most university missions focus on the learning and success of undergraduate and graduate students; high-quality, impactful research; and making an impact in the community and the world. Library publishing programs connect to the university mission explicitly in developing their programs and services. The library's central role to the university's mission in teaching, learning, and research is understood; library publishing expands on this mission as do other services provided via the library, such as data management, support for digital scholarship, institutional repository (IR) services, research assistance, and others. An important part of a new library publishing business or strategic plan includes a focus on the university's strategic plan and on ways that the library can advance and further the university's mission, vision, strategic goals, and objectives. This includes defining the scope of services; budgetary requirements; staffing and governance; any plans to provide commercial content as well as open-access materials; goals and objectives; and measures of success.

## WHAT IS LIBRARY PUBLISHING?

In this section, we will explore how library publishing is defined, its characteristics and values, how it is distinct from university publishers, its history, and some of the needs that are filled by library publishers.

Library publishing is “the set of activities led by college and university libraries to support the creation, dissemination, and curation of scholarly, creative, and/or educational works.

Generally, library publishing requires a production process, presents original work not previously made available, and applies a level of certification to the content published, whether through peer review or extension of the institutional brand.

Based on core library values and building on the traditional skills of librarians, it is distinguished from other publishing fields by a preference for Open Access dissemination and a willingness to embrace informal and experimental forms of scholarly communication and to challenge the status quo.

— Library Publishing Coalition

Library publishers offer a suite of publishing services that support the production, dissemination, and preservation of scholarly works. These services largely complement and extend the traditional skill sets and functions performed by the library. Library publishers report service areas including copyright advising, metadata services, training, digitization, and the hosting of supplemental content—for example, audio, video, data, and visualizations, often in an institutional repository. Library publishers also offer analytics, cataloging, outreach, ISSN assignment, DOI assignment, media streaming, advising services for authors, advising for editors on ethical standards and best practices for publishing, data set management, marketing, peer review management, graphic design, and preservation services. Library publishers additionally support a broad range of publication types including, but not limited to, journals, monographs, textbooks, technical reports, conference proceedings, data sets, digital humanities projects, and theses and dissertations.

The annual Library Publishing Directory shows that the reach of library publishers is continuing to expand, both in terms of the number of publications produced and also in the types of non-campus-based partnerships in which they engage (Library Publishing Coalition Directory Committee, 2022).

### The History and Need for Library Publishing

The demand for digital scholarship services and publishing as a service has increased dramatically in the last 20 years. Sarah Lippincott wrote in her book *Library as Publisher* (2017) that (academic) libraries saw the early potential of institutional repositories (IR) to apply leverage to the scholarly communication ecosystem. The budgetary pressures on academic libraries from the much-discussed crisis in scholarly communication both instigated and accelerated the transition from print to digital collections (see ALA's "Principles and Strategies for the Reform of Scholarly Communication"). Because libraries are often large computing centers on campus, IRs may have thus found a home there, providing the necessary technological infrastructure and serving as a place to house digital collections: IRs as platform.

As digital collections grew, many academic libraries found themselves the curators of their institution's Electronic Theses and Dissertations (ETDs) in their IRs, which replaced print theses in library collections. ETDs helped frame IRs as a locus for scholarship, and IRs posed the opportunity for libraries to collect and disseminate other forms of open scholarship situated in their institutions: technical reports, pre-prints, grey literature. At the same time, the burgeoning open-access movement cast these open publications as an activism against commercial enclosure of the scholarly market, which set the stage for libraries to experiment with hosting open-access journals and other content in their IRs as well. These developments expanded libraries' understanding of their IRs, growing them into a program as well as a platform, with positions created to develop and manage strategies for populating their IRs and marketing them to their institutions.

The types of publications produced by library publishing have also become more experimental over the years. New forms of scholarship, such as digital scholarship projects and multimedia publishing, have not typically been well supported by more traditional publishers. While this is slowly changing, these projects have found a home in many library publishing programs and IRs, which are often more willing to experiment with new forms of publication and preservation. Library publishing programs have also been able to support other types of works that traditionally do not have designated places to be published, such as student journals and projects and other pedagogically oriented works. For more information on new types of publishing, see the “Where Are We Headed in (Library) Publishing?” section in the Introduction Module.

Library publishing today thus fills a number of unmet needs in the scholarly ecosystem, allowing for new and different types of works to be published and made openly available that would otherwise not. This system, however, is not without its faults. Library publishing programs typically run on a service model, which means that those who ask for help are typically the ones who get their content published. This creates a gap between who and what is included through library publishing and who and what is left out. Library publishing programs are also limited in what they can do by funding, available resources, and staffing, which can further restrict what gets published. We will explore the role of library publishers and these themes more in future sections.

## Library Publishing Characteristics and Values

Library publishing is a distinct field with an already diverse publishing environment. Even so, it has a number of common characteristics, which we’ll go through now.

### **Responsive to Mission and Stakeholders, Not Shareholders**

Library publishing programs are typically established to extend the mission of the library, including a commitment to increasing access and preserving content. Unlike commercial publishers, library publishers do not have shareholders to satisfy or profit margins to increase.

### **Leverages Existing Library Skills and Knowledge**

Library publishers benefit from the compatibility of many publishing activities with library-based knowledge, including technology management, discoverability, preservation, and digitization. These skills supplement traditional publishing knowledge and provide a solid foundation for establishing library publishing programs, which can expand into new areas, such as marketing, editing, and acquisitions.

Due to overlapping skills as well as limited budget and staffing resources for many library publishers, libraries often redeploy existing staff in support of publishing services. This leads to a professionally diverse workforce in library publishing, with backgrounds ranging from scholarly communication to technical services and beyond. Partial FTE positions are common, as noted in the latest Library Publishing Directory: The average number of staff involved in library publishing was “2.8 FTE (126 respondents to this question) for professional staff and 2.7 FTE for paraprofessional (50 respondents),” as opposed to full-time, specialized positions that are a feature of traditional or university press

publishing operations (Library Publishing Coalition Directory Committee, 2022, p. ix). For more information, see the section “Who Is a Library Publisher?” in the Introduction Module and Unit 3: Staffing and Governance in the Sustainability Module.

However, it is important to keep in mind that each library environment is unique, and the staffing model employed may vary widely from institution to institution.

### **Values Open Access, Not Profits**

Libraries see open access as a valued goal that is part of the library’s mission to increase access to information. The result is a more enthusiastic response to the challenge of open access and an ethical desire to find innovative approaches to make content available while sustaining operations. In library publishing environments, open dissemination is the primary value that drives us—not the value of profits, which often drives commercial publishers—not because commercial publishers are wrong or fundamentally unethical, but because profits are what they’re structured to value most highly: returns to stockholders.

### **Funding Primarily Comes From the University, Not Sales**

Another unique characteristic of library publishing is that most of its operating revenue comes from the parent institution, rather than sales (as in commercial and, more often of late, university press publishing). According to the Library Publishing Directory, just under half of respondents (43%) report receiving all of their funding from the library’s operational budget, 31% of respondents indicated that some of their funding came from the library’s operational budget, and an additional 6% report drawing all of their funding from the materials’ budget (Library Publishing Coalition Directory Committee, 2022, p. ix). No library since 2019 has reported any revenue coming from licensing, but 14 programs receive funding from grants, 11 receive funding from sales, and 9 receive funding from chargebacks.

### **Flexible and Responsive to Author and Editor Needs**

Library publishing initiatives provide scholars with services they understand, need, and value. Librarians are able to meet scholars in their own community and support them with efficient knowledge production, rapid dissemination of their research, and improved access to scholarly outputs. Library publishers are more likely than traditional publishers to take on experimental one-off projects that meet the needs of an individual author or to otherwise tailor services to individuals or small communities of authors.

### **Frequently Lacks a Sustainable Business Model Leading to Long-Term Risk**

Library publishers typically do not have a steady stream of revenue from book sales or subscriptions, so they are typically funded by the libraries in which they are housed. Library budgets are commonly under pressure, and without a clear business plan, the long-term viability of many library publishing programs may therefore be at risk. See the Sustainability Module for more on how to create a business plan for library publishing.

## Expanding Into a Global Phenomenon

Library publishing is expanding around the world, with significant projects in Africa, Australia, Europe, South America, and the rest of the world. In 2019 the International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions (IFLA) Library Publishing (LibPub) Special Interest Group (SIG) was formed. The globally focused IFLA LibPubSIG is an international collaborator to the primarily North America–focused Library Publishing Coalition, indicating this work’s global growth. We encourage you to track the development of library publishing globally to learn about new practices and discover opportunities for expanded collaborations and partnerships. Beginning in 2020, the Library Publishing Coalition and the IFLA LibPub SIG began partnering to survey the landscape of publishing in libraries across the globe. The LibPub SIG has produced an interactive map that showcases the international locales where library publishing takes place (IFLA Library Publishing Special Interest Group, n.d.). The number of library publishers from outside the U.S. reporting on their work has steadily increased in recent years, as can also be witnessed in recent directory listings (Library Publishing Coalition Directory Committee, 2022).

## Developing as a Community of Practice

As with other disciplinary or professional communities, library publishing has developed into a unique community of practice, with professional organizations, meetings, and professional development opportunities tailored to the specific needs and values of the community. The Library Publishing Coalition is the most notable example of an organization dedicated to the work of this community. There are also a number of shared associations between library publishers and “traditional” publishers (i.e., university presses, commercial publishers), such as the Society for Scholarly Publishing (SSP) and Open Access Scholarly Publishers Association (OASPA). For a more complete list of organizations related to library publishing, see the Introduction Module’s “Library Publishing as a Research Discipline” section and Appendix A.

## Differentiating Library Publishing From University Presses

Library publishing units, in whatever size and service model they come in, are often mistaken for university presses by faculty members, administrators, and students on campus. While a few library publishers do serve in a press capacity and others work alongside their university’s press, many library publishers function completely separately from university presses, especially as not all universities have presses. Not only are the organizational structures between university presses and library presses different but their missions are also often very different, as outlined in the “Library Publishing Characteristics and Values” section of the Introduction Module. As Katherine Skinner et al said in their foundational article, “Library-as-Publisher” (2014),

Library publishing is differentiated from the work of other publishers—including commercial, society, academic, and trade—in large part by its *business model*, which often relies heavily on being subsidized through the library budget, rather than operating primarily as a cost-recovery or profit-driven activity. (emphasis added)



Whereas university administrators often stress that university presses need to function in a cost-recovery model that seems commercially or market driven, library publishing is primarily service-focused. The service mission of library publishers prompts them to publish a wider spectrum of texts than what university presses can often afford to publish. Library publishers typically, though not always, work on a non-profit or cost-recovery business model, subvented by the library budget, and that subvention can often cover the digital-only delivery method of library publishing, as those publishers work to ensure everything they publish is open-access. The goal is to publish as many researchers as possible, across the globe, and to make that research accessible across the globe. For more information, see the “What Role Does Open Access Play?” section in the Introduction Module. For more on business models, see also the Sustainability Module’s Unit 1: Business Basics and Unit 2: Financial Basics. Library publishers also take different roles in integrating editorial and design work into their publishing processes, whereas editorial and design work is *always* part of the university press’s mission.

University presses (UPs) work with a for-profit or cost-recovery model that is subvented both by universities and by toll-access delivery or fees for readers; often these fees help to pay for that editorial and design work. (See the Introduction Module’s “Where Library Publishing Takes Place” section for more on these distinctions.) For UPs, their primary delivery mechanism has always been situated as a print-only or print-first product, and that still holds true for many though not all of their book products. For UPs that publish journals, however, many deliver article-based content through traditional print subscriptions as well as through digital subscriptions via platforms such as JSTOR.

### Differentiating Library Publishing From Digital Scholarship Centers

Library publishers can often be mistaken for other units on campus besides the press that also function as publishers. When the University of Michigan Publishing was researching the need for a service publisher (i.e., a library publisher) for their campus, they discovered that a dozen or more units already existed on campus that published their own materials from within their own departments. One unit that is most often confused with the library publisher—in many cases because they work together *with* the library publishing unit—is an institution’s digital scholarship center, which can go by many names in and of itself.

Sometimes the digital scholarship unit exists independently of the library and other times it’s a unit within the library that focuses on helping authors with digital humanities projects through editorial or design assistance or grant-writing assistance. These other units may call on the support of the library publishing unit to host content once it is completed or ask for other types of production support, such as metadata, DOI, and cataloging help.

Emory University provides one example of a set of digital publishing centers that collaborate to publish projects: an author might work with the publishing director in the Fox Center for Humanistic Inquiry (i.e., a humanities center unaffiliated with the library), who helps the author partner with the Emory Center for Digital Scholarship, which is housed in the library and which subsumed several existing library operations including the institutional repository, the teaching and learning center, and digital collections, among others. Emory University does not have a university press. In contrast, Michigan State

University has a university press *and* upwards of ten different digital humanities centers on campus, several with a focus on digital publishing of the kinds that the library might also do (including at least two centers in the library itself). These units may or may not coordinate work and have different business models, some service-oriented and some grant- or cost-recovery oriented.

## HOW LIBRARY PUBLISHING PROMOTES INCLUSIVITY, DIVERSITY, AND EQUITY

Because library publishing programs are often mission-driven and not beholden to sales and profit, library publishers can find opportunities to advance inclusion, diversity, and equity in publishing. Library publishing programs can, as Harrison W. Inefuku wrote, “create a pipeline of emerging scholars who understand the processes, politics, and power dynamics of academic publishing,” not only from within the mainstream white culture that has dominated library and academic culture for centuries, but from BIPOC, LGBTQ+, and multi-marginalized scholars who can speak from a place of expertise that needs to be heard (2021, p. 208).

### Libraries As White Spaces

Charlotte Roh and Harrison W. Inefuku (2016) locate academic publishing at the intersection of three professions: academia, publishing, and librarianship. The demographics of all three professions in the United States trail the diversity of the country as a whole. 88% of librarians and 73% of library assistants identified as white (ALA Office for Research & Statistics et al., 2007). Libraries generally do not reflect the communities they serve, and library publishing is no better: 84% of academic library staff in the United States working in publishing, scholarly communication, and copyright identified as white, non-Hispanic—the least racially diverse job category included in the study. An Ithaka S+R report indicated that staff at research libraries identify as 71% white overall (Schonfeld & Sweeney, 2017). This problem extends to university presses as well, where 76% of staff identify as white, based on a study by Lee & Low Books (2020).

### White Supremacist History of Scholarly Publishing

Bias in publishing might be the biggest issue impacting scholarly publishing. Implicit and explicit bias impacts what and whom we publish. Library publishing is a site where we can undo some of that harm. For instance, bias in peer review and selection of manuscripts leads to gatekeeping in scholarly publishing that is meant to purposefully keep people out of the publishing pipeline. Gatekeeping has been a defining aspect of scholarly publishing through editorial and peer review. Jacalyn Kelly, Tara Sadeghieh, and Khosrow Adeli identified two primary purposes for peer review: “Firstly, it acts as a filter to ensure that only high quality research is published [...] by determining the validity, significance and originality of the study. Secondly, peer review is intended to improve the quality of manuscripts that are deemed suitable for publication” (2014, p. 228). Through these practices, scholarly publishing has defined what is considered “legitimate” knowledge.

However, while editorial and peer review is intended to validate research, it has often resulted in excluding marginalized groups from publishing, which also means readers and researchers lose out on a wealth of expertise because of the limitations of whose work they get access to read. “Through gatekeeping practices” such as peer review, Inefuku reminds us, “academic publishing deprives communities of color of representation in many spheres of society beyond academia, and of knowledge necessary to advance an antiracist and anti-oppressive agenda” (2021, p. 198). Christine A. Stanley also points out this exclusion: “There is a master narrative operating in academia that often defines and limits what is valued as scholarship and who is entitled to create scholarship. This is problematic because the dominant group in academia writes most research and, more often than not, they are white men” (2007, p. 14).

Peer review practices as a form of white supremacist gatekeeping is based on centuries of practice in the publishing industry. These practices are intimately tied into the power structures of capitalism, which is meant to keep cis heterosexual white men in power. Library publishing works from a radically different business model that values open-access and service-based publishing (as explained elsewhere in this Introduction Module), which also means library publishing can work to dismantle the white supremacist gatekeeping approach to publishing by opening the floodgates for all possible research to be accessible to everyone.

As an organization, the Library Publishing Coalition (LPC) has become distinctly aware of the issues of white supremacy within publishing practices writ large and has worked to dismantle racist practices (particularly in a U.S. and North American context, where the way racism functions within academia and society is endemic). The LPC’s *Roadmap for Anti-Racist Practice* outlines how the LPC and other library publishing organizations and members can strive to dismantle racist publishing practices from the individual, institutional, and organizational perspectives. The roadmap states:

Change is needed at the level of the LPC, LPC member institutions, and the publishing programs members administer. Just as the LPC needs to take a critical look at its own structures and processes, members need to do the same, examining the strength of their own commitments to anti-racism and anti-oppression, enacting change where necessary, and assessing progress along the way. [...] This includes creating an environment of equitable labor and technological practices for our workforce, as well as taking a critical look at the voices we provide space for, what we consider to be scholarly work, and what we consider to be publication. (LPC Diversity and Inclusion Task Force, 2021, p. 1)

In the next section, we further outline ways that librarians can approach their publishing practices through an anti-racist, anti-oppressive lens, in recognition of the need for more voices in scholarly publishing, expand who is considered an “expert” in research arenas, and to create spaces that support and encourage underheard or unheard voices in our everyday practices.

## Decentering Power Structures Through Authorship, Peer Review, and Publishing

Without self-reflection and organized efforts to shift power in publishing, open-access efforts risk simply replicating biases and injustices endemic to the traditional scholarly communication system. (Roh et al., 2020, p. 49)

Library publishing programs have a responsibility to adopt anti-racist and anti-oppressive policies and practices. One practice they can adopt is to publish more authors who hold marginalized identities and to expand who gets to function as an “expert” within the academy. Seek out and create partnerships with scholars and authors outside of the academy who can speak to underheard experiences. Some library-press partnerships also provide additional support to authors who hold marginalized identities, such as the UC Press FirstGen Program and the MIT Press Grant Program for Diverse Voices.

Another practice library publishers can put into place is to encourage representative editorial boards and peer reviewer pools with any journals they publish. And ensure that any typical gate-keeping methods are interrogated prior to engaging with an author’s text. A good resource that has arisen for this work is the Anti-Racist Scholarly Reviewing Practices: A Heuristic for Editors, Reviewers, and Authors document, which outlines the following practices for editors, reviewers, and authors to consider (Cagle et al., 2021, pp. 7–9):

- Recognize a range of expertise and encourage citation practices that represent diverse canons, epistemological foundations, and ways of knowing
- Recognize, intervene in, and/or prevent harmful scholarly work—both in publication processes and in published scholarship
- Establish and state clear but flexible contingency plans for review processes that prioritize humanity over production
- Make the review process transparent
- Value the labor of those involved in the review process
- Editors commit to inclusivity among reviewers and in editorial board makeup

The Iowa State University Digital Press’s diversity policy states, “We strongly encourage journal editors and conference organizers to build editorial boards and peer reviewer pools that are inclusive of a diversity of identities, geographics, perspectives, and lived experiences appropriate to the scope of the journal or conference.” *Kairos*, an independent diamond open-access journal includes the following peer-review criteria (as part of a larger selection) that aims to bring inclusivity to the forefront of authors’ and reviewers’ practices (Kairos Editorial Board, n.d.):

- **METHODOLOGY:** Is the overall contribution clearly supported by relevant methods and evidence (whether or not there's a specific methodology, experimental design, or anti-racist method employed)?
- **CITATIONS:** Does the author cite inclusively? That is, does the scholarly review (if appropriate) draw from a range of relevant feminist and cultural rhetorical traditions, include scholars from multiple identities (gender, race, disability) if known, or include research in multiple forms (open v. closed-access)?

These criteria were revised to this version in 2020, as the journal began to see more and more contributions from Indigenous scholars employing indigenous methodologies that might otherwise be rejected as non-rigorous by the long tradition of white supremacist expertise in research. Library publishers can encourage editors to create more inclusive peer review criteria and editorial boards, and can include such requirements in their onboarding conversations with new journal editors.

Library publishers can also promote the use of inclusive language, when copyediting or working with vendors who will be copyediting. Organizations like the Council of Editors of Learned Journals maintain open lists of inclusive copy-editing style guides, adding new ones as updates are made.

In addition to their publishing activities, library publishing programs can take advantage of the library's role in education to promote inclusive modes of publishing, including hosting workshops for researchers of color and providing education on bias in publishing.

## WHERE LIBRARY PUBLISHING TAKES PLACE

In the previous sections, we outlined some of the ways that library publishing works to decenter the power structures of scholarly publishing. As library publishing units enter the publishing foray, they can make a big impact on the availability of a wider swath of research to the scholarly community. These units don't grow out of nowhere—they're created when librarians move from being stewards of collections to providers of services and content (that then, of course, also need stewarding).

This change in who is a publisher coincides with the question of where publishing takes place. The first version of this curriculum outlined the strong knowledge influence from university presses on academic library publishing units, with the idea that these library units might model their work on university presses while also expanding what university presses are able to publish. This perspective was accurate and adequate at the time of that writing. Since then, however, library publishing has begun to define its work along a continuum, at one end in conjunction with university presses (as the first edition and early research in library publishing noted) and at the other end as completely independent entities running their own library presses. Increasingly many library publishing units reside in smaller university and college libraries, public libraries, and cultural heritage institutions.

With this branching of library publishing into different institutional homes, the size and scope of these publishing units have expanded to include a spectrum from

- Small departments of one Digital Publishing or Scholarly Communication or Open Educational Resource librarian who may be solely responsible for overseeing publishing existing content in the institutional repository;
- Mid-sized departments of several librarians and occasionally other staff, some possibly assigned part-time to digital publishing while also serving other areas of library outreach), who help produce a wider swath of digital publishing materials while likely outsourcing some of the editorial and production workflow;
- Large departments of many librarians and other staff positions where content is acquired, created, editorially supervised, produced, published, and preserved.

How the size and scope of these units play out is often specific to the institution and its publishing niche—that is, a very small publishing unit in a public library will differ radically in scope and ability from a very large publishing unit at a research library. We invite readers to visit Unit 3: Staffing and Governance in the Sustainability Module for more details on staffing structures in different publishing units.

Where university press publishing has a well-defined scope and literally centuries of practice in a streamlined and heavily print-based workflow, library-based publishing services span a broader continuum of activities, ranging from informal distribution without editorial or peer review to traditional, formal publishing practices. Although service models do vary from institution to institution, six models are common and are described below. It should be noted that many libraries might fall in multiple model types at once, such as serving as a content host through an institutional repository *and* serving as a content publisher by offering some editorial publishing services that are then hosted on the IR or in other platforms.

### Library As Administrative Home of a University Press

A common relationship between university libraries and university presses is when the press is administratively (and often physically) located within the library. In this model, the press functions as a completely independent entity, but reports (administratively) to the library administration. The benefits of this model from the press perspective are continued autonomy, improved visibility within the university, and a certain degree of financial protection as part of the library's overall budget. Presses may also benefit from centralized library support services, such as IT or human resources. From a library perspective, the collocation of the press can lead to increased interaction, opportunity for collaborative projects, and the cross-development of skills, experience, and expertise.

### Library As University Press Service Provider

Another common arrangement sees the library as a service provider to the university press. There is admittedly some overlap between the “library as service provider” and “library–university press partnerships” models (see below), with the distinction primarily in the nature of the relationship—is there a shared project or vision at the heart of it, or is the library simply providing services to serve press needs? This may be fluid within single institutions and across different projects or initiatives.

A 2013 survey on press and library collaborations by the Association of University Presses (then called the Association of *American* University Presses) found that “53% of [responding] libraries provide [...] service[s] ranging from digitization, metadata, and preservation services to office support and rent-free space” to university presses (AAUP Library Relations Committee, 2013, p. 3). These services are often intended to augment access to, or otherwise enhance, press content. For example, some libraries digitize and provide access to the press' out-of-print or low-sale backlist titles while others host online editions of, or supplementary content for, current press titles.

## Library–University Press Partnerships

As noted earlier, the distinction between “library as service provider” and “library as partner” is fluid. However, for the purposes of defining categories, “library-press partnerships” are defined as those in which there is a shared project or goal, and in which each partner has sufficiently equal creative input and control. One example of this type of partnership is when a library publisher and university press publisher work collaboratively to produce shared, or multiple deliverables, for a project—as when a library hosts an interactive eBook version with linked multimedia assets for a book project while the university press publishes a print and ePub version of the book project. Both have a relatively equal stake in the completion of the project(s) and each may have a separate editorial process to complete it. Another example of a creative partnership is seen when a press provides marketing and print distribution services for content created, sponsored, or controlled by the library.

## Library As Publisher—Content ‘Host’

If these categories are arranged on a continuum, with the “library as administrative home of the press” model as a simple collocation of the library with publishing functions (the press), then this category begins to see the library assuming some independent control of publishing functions—whether or not a university press is housed within the same institution. This is perhaps the easiest direct role that a library can play—providing a hosting platform for original content, whether scholarly journals, student journals, monographs, or other. In this model, a library will provide a platform, such as Digital Commons or Open Journal Systems, and may provide support and guidance on following best practices in open-access journal publishing. However, a library following this model will usually not provide any meaningful support for editorial or production activities, other than ensuring the final works are available online through the platform. This service may be offered for new publications or for existing publications that are migrated to a new format or platform. Some libraries may provide one-time digitization or other ingest services as part of the hosting arrangement for existing journals. Some libraries also provide enhanced technological services, such as registering ISSNs, minting DOIs, providing preservation systems, etc. The majority of activities that are involved in operating an institutional repository would also fall under this model.

## Library As Publisher—Content ‘Publisher’

Further on the continuum, this model involves the library taking a more active role in the production of the content—whether that involves editorial support such as copyediting, production support such as layout and design, or enhanced distribution strategies (e.g., pursuing contracts with content aggregators). The service level at each library varies, and whether there is a formal publishing imprint or brand (such as with the University of Nebraska-Lincoln’s Zea Books imprint or University of Pittsburgh’s Pitt Open imprint) depends on the university. There may or may not be a university press at these institutions.

## Library As Press—Full Publishing Services

This final model, “library as press,” is distinguished from the initial “library as administrative home of press” model by two primary factors: the genesis of the press or publishing program and its integration with the library as a whole. In this model, the library “press” is a library-born initiative and is an extension of the library’s mission. Ideally, staff and resources are shared between the library press and other library units (e.g., repository services, technical services, etc.). However, the level of integration will vary between libraries. The “library as press” is largely indistinguishable, in terms of services and quality, from a traditional university press (although many library presses are experimenting with alternative publication formats). It should also be noted that a distinction is made here between “library as publisher” and “library as press”—while the former may involve an established program of services, the latter involves the creation of a brand identity and strategic self-promotion to external audiences.

## WHAT ROLE DOES OPEN ACCESS PLAY?

As mentioned elsewhere in this Introduction, open access is the primary goal of much library publishing. This section explains why that’s the case.

“Open access” was first used to describe aspects of free, online scholarly literature at a meeting in Budapest in December 2001, sponsored by the Open Society Institute (Hagemann, 2012). Participants issued a statement known as the Budapest Open Access Initiative, or BOAI. The BOAI has come to be regarded as foundational to the open-access movement. It defined open access to scholarly literature as:

“free availability on the public internet, permitting any users to read, download, copy, distribute, print, search, or link to the full texts of these articles [...] or use them for any other lawful purpose, without [...] barriers other than those inseparable from gaining access [...] The only constraint [...] should be to give authors control over the integrity of their work and the right to be properly acknowledged and cited.” (Chan et al., 2002)

This was further refined in statements developed at Bethesda and Berlin in 2003, which consolidate BOAI to define open access as the copyright holder’s pre-consent to let users copy, use, distribute, transmit and publicly display a work, and to make and distribute derivative works, “in any digital medium for any responsible purpose, subject to proper attribution” (as cited in Suber, 2012, p. 8).

One proposed framework for conceptualizing open access (or open content) which encapsulates the above is a suite of activities summarized as “the five Rs,” consisting of the ability to:

- Reuse
- Rework (alter or transform)
- Remix (combine with other works)
- Redistribute (share the above), and
- Retain



These uses correspond to the activities made possible by Creative Commons and other open license frameworks, and operationalize the BOAI goals to their fullest extent. They describe the ethos of open access: that scholarship (and indeed any open content) should be free of commercial and regulatory restraints that unnecessarily interfere with the goals of the academy, that knowledge should be available and positioned to enable the creation of new knowledge, and that scholars should be in conversation with the ideas of other scholars.

Open access interrupts the existing revenue models for funding research publication, as users cannot be charged for access. While initial visions for open access anticipated that universities and other knowledge institutions would fill the gap, providing infrastructure and what minimal labor might be necessary when duplication and distribution are essentially free, this hasn't entirely proven the case. Infrastructure has certainly been developed in the academy, notably the widespread adoption of institutional and disciplinary repositories and open publishing software such as the Public Knowledge Project's Open Journal Systems (OJS). But the profit motive remains strong, and open-access publishing has given rise to several alternative business models, discussed here, that seek to replicate or replace the revenue-generating features of the commercial scholarly publishing enterprise.

Some scholarly disciplines have embraced open-access theory and practice. Physics and mathematics have a longstanding tradition of sharing open research through pre-print servers like arXiv, and school-situated law review outlets are largely open-access by default. The hard sciences in particular benefit from rapid sharing of research; open access facilitates this goal and so has enjoyed more widespread adoption there. Others, like history and chemistry, have proven consistently opposed to the practice, not necessarily without reason (since U.S. copyright doesn't apply to facts, for instance, history scholarship suffers a lack of certain protections under the law that discourages scholars from sharing in advance of publication). open-access publications as a class also bear a reputation as being less sound and so less prestigious, partly derived from the phenomenon of "predatory" publishing outlined below. For scholars who seek acknowledgment of their publications by tenure committees, this reputation can discourage publication in open-access outlets. This reputation persists despite the fact that many commercial scholarly publishers have embraced open access, and many pure open-access publications enjoy high impact factors and other metrics of prestige.

Open access is increasingly seen as a commercial imperative by the institutions and funders responsible for the research infrastructure. South/Latin America has long maintained an institutionally based, fully open access national infrastructure for scholarship, where universities support and publish their own scholars' research, notably SciELO, the Scientific Electronic Library Online, and Sistema de Información Científica Redalyc, a network of non-commercial academy-owned diamond open-access scientific journals. Institutions of higher education in the United States, who are required to pay for access to research produced by their own faculty, are beginning to organize for open-access publication through strategies like transformative agreements and the OA2020 initiative. In the European Union, where research is more directly funded by governments, funders have begun to leverage requirements to demand open access to resulting publications, an initiative known as Plan S. U.S. government funders in the sciences employ similar tactics to require that funded research be made openly available through federal repositories like PubMed Central.

The moral imperative for open access as a justice movement is often simplified to economic terms: knowledge, especially publicly funded knowledge, is a public good and should be free to the public. But the implementation of open access can either relieve or exacerbate current inequities in global access to research, depending on the approach. When open access is filtered through existing commercial and economic processes, controlled and determined by U.S. and Euro-centric institutions (for lack of a better term, the “global north”), it can perpetuate a lack of access in other parts of the global research community, and exclude perspectives from geographies not already participating in the existing systems. Funding priorities from institutions in the global north put pressure on researchers in other parts of the world to align their interests with colonial powers or risk their research agendas being rejected. Some argue that library publishing can counteract this phenomenon, as academic libraries in research institutions across the globe can provide an alternative, locally determined scholarly publishing ecosystem that frees scholars from contributing to the colonial infrastructures that perpetuate inequities.

## Open-Access Business Models

Several business models have emerged to support open access to scholarly content and replace revenue previously generated through subscription fees. Many publishers charge Article Processing Charges (APCs), or Book Publishing Charges (BPCs) for open-access books, which are typically paid by the author or their institution prior to publication. These processing charges can range from a few hundred to several thousand dollars per article. While these charges are an eligible expense supported by some research funders, APCs and BPCs nevertheless present a barrier for scholars who do not have access to the funds necessary to publish their work in these journals (Jain et al., 2020). These charges may also be problematic for institutions that seek to support their authors through the provision of an open-access fund. Institutions that are already faced with high subscription costs for paywalled resources may find the addition of processing charges difficult to fund. APCs and BPCs effectively shift inequity from a “who-can-read” model, where subscription costs block access to research, to a “who-can-publish” model, where processing charges block access to the press.

Open-access business models have resulted in several different “colors” or types of open access, including:

- Green open access: This refers to scholarship that is published in a traditional subscription journal, but with a version of the work (often the “post-print,” or the version after peer review but before publisher typesetting) made available through an open-access repository. Subscription journals may enforce an embargo period (typically 12 to 36 months) which delays open access through the green open-access model.
- Gold open access. Gold open-access journals publish work that is fully open access (with no embargo or subscription costs for any work in the journal), but charge Article Processing Charges to authors, their institution, or their funders.
- Diamond or platinum open access. Similar to the Gold open-access model, diamond or platinum open-access journals publish work that is fully open access, but in this case they do not charge

APCs. Such journals may use an alternative sustainability model, such as association fees, community donations, or volunteerism.

- Hybrid open access. This model refers to journals that publish some work behind subscription paywalls, while giving authors the “choice” to make their individual article openly available for a fee. This model can be particularly problematic for institutions who pay once for subscription access to some content, and then again for APCs to make other content openly available.

## Issues in Open Access

### Prevalence in Library Publishing

Many library publishing programs support mostly or fully open-access publications and content, and a diamond (no-fee) open-access model is often promoted through these programs. Library publishing’s preference for open access extends from libraries’ core values, including “access, confidentiality/privacy, democracy, diversity, education and lifelong learning, intellectual freedom, preservation, the public good, professionalism, service, social responsibility, and sustainability” (ALA Council, 2019). By supporting editors and authors through services like free hosting and technical support for one or more publishing platforms, and guidance on publishing practices and ethics through workshops, consultations, and documentation, library publishing programs are well-positioned to contribute to the growth of open-access publishing in a push for more equitable and sustainable forms of scholarly communication.

### “Predatory” Publishing

Alongside the increasing number of open-access journals have come a number of publishers, oftentimes called “predatory,” that many scholars want to avoid. So-called “predatory” journals and publishers are difficult to define. In 2019, a group of scholars and publishers from 10 countries collaborated to come to a consensus on this definition: “Predatory journals and publishers are entities that prioritize self-interest at the expense of scholarship and are characterized by false or misleading information, deviation from best editorial and publication practices, a lack of transparency, and/or the use of aggressive and indiscriminate solicitation practices” (Grudniewicz et al., 2019, p. 211).

In general, predatory publishers or journals do not provide the services that are usually expected of a reputable publisher, such as thorough peer-review, editing, distribution to an audience that is appropriate to the author’s work, and adding to the author’s reputation as a scholar. But while “predatory” is a framing that is typically used to cast open-access publishing in a negative light, it can also reasonably describe practices of closed access or commercial scholarly publishers, including charging exorbitant article processing charges, instituting maximalist copyright transfer policies, establishing sister or mirror journals to capture spillover submissions, or even (and perhaps especially) supporting the impact factor itself as a metric of prestige.

Predatory publishing has been a challenge for those who work in scholarly communication for many reasons. Open access and its various modalities (green, gold, hybrid) are already difficult to understand and hard to navigate. In addition, people may equate open-access publishing with predatory publishing, or they may be unwilling to work through the process of evaluating an open-access journal to determine

its reputability. In many ways it is easier to simply publish in a traditional journal instead. Lastly, faculty members may not seek outside guidance or be willing to learn new best practices in publishing—like what qualities to look for in a reputable open-access journal. Increasing awareness of open access and getting buy-in has been and continues to be an uphill battle, and predatory publishers create additional confusion and labor for scholarly communication workers and authors.

## Tenure and Promotion

While library publishing highly values open-access publishing, there is still a fair amount of myth-busting to be done before some faculty members accept open access as a viable publishing mechanism. In addition to the issue of predatory online journals, there is still a lot of confusion around whether open-access publications count towards a researcher's tenure and promotion bid at their institution. Whether fair or not, open-access publication is often seen as akin to self-publication, conflating the democratic nature of access to the internet with a lack of quality in internet-only publications. A research project by the ScholCommLab, in which they reviewed 850 tenure and promotion guidelines at universities across Canada and the U.S., indicated that open access was barely mentioned in any of the documents despite many universities' call for more public and community scholarship (Alperin et al., 2019). Publications in highly ranked journals are still considered the golden ticket for tenure and promotion by most faculty, but more and more highly ranked journals are also open-access through green and gold methods mentioned earlier.

Whether a faculty member chooses to publish work in an open-access venue—be it an article, book, chapter, data set, or digital humanities project—is often a departmental or disciplinary question. Decisions about open-access publishing differ radically between the life and physical sciences, social sciences, mathematics, humanities, and the arts, with a general bend towards embracing open-access publishing in the sciences that dates back to the start of the Internet when scientists could more easily share in-progress research to colleagues across the world, and, in more recent decades, the proliferation of disciplinary specific pre-print archives where in-progress articles could be uploaded for peer review prior to submission to a journal. In the humanities and arts, however, the skepticism towards open-access publishing remains strong, with a few exceptions for non-traditional publishing projects such as digital humanities websites or online exhibits, though even these are sometimes still viewed as service-oriented projects, not research publications.

Yet, more and more disciplines are starting to recognize that peer review is the mechanism on which open-access publishing can be valued. With scholarly communication organizations that focus on online publishing—such as the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE), the Directory of Open Access Journals (DOAJ), and Open Access Scholarly Publishers Association (OASPA)—that offer guidelines requiring review processes for open-access journals be spelled out explicitly on journal websites, it has become an expectation that any scholarly open-access journal or book provide thorough documentation of their peer review process (regardless of *which* peer review process they choose) to ensure that all researchers' publications will count toward their tenure and promotion needs.

## Openness in Conversation With Potential Harm

Open access is not without valid critiques and concerns that should be considered and addressed in library publishing. As libraries clarify their stance as non-neutral entities, we have the opportunity to stand up against hateful, demeaning, and dehumanizing ideas. Library publishers need to grapple with the extent of editorial oversight they have on the content published under the library brand and how and when to intervene against content that is contradictory to library values or may be harmful to members of its community. Similarly, as dis/misinformation is on the rise, library publishers need to consider how to address situations where this arises in the work published under their brand.

What we provide open access to can directly or indirectly harm individuals or communities. One widely used example: Indigenous communities may have cultural understandings and frameworks of knowledge that reserve authority over exactly who can transmit or receive particular kinds of traditional knowledge. Where these kinds of information appear in open scholarship, the mode of access risks violating the imperatives of the community. Open access can also lead to identification of at-risk persons or groups, through de-anonymization of data or other forms of privacy violation. At the very least, open-access publishers bear an increased burden of understanding and mitigating the potential harms inherent in the content they publish.

Open-access business models can act as gatekeeping structures to exclude entire knowledge communities, as discussed in the consideration of Article Processing Charges (APCs). When publishers adopt APCs, they implicate themselves in a host of decisions about which scholarship deserves funding and who deserves to be published—decisions that often work against scholars outside the center of the Eurocentric publishing apparatus. Because open access offers such promise to readers and researchers who cannot afford the cost of scholarly subscription, it is doubly frustrating for those same researchers to find themselves barred from contributing their knowledge to the open record. Establishing alternatives to the APC and providing pathways to publication for a global research community are strategies against the structural harms of APC-based open-access publishing.

## WHO IS A LIBRARY PUBLISHER?

### Careers in Library Publishing

Library publishing can be categorized as a relatively new field within the larger careers of publishing and librarianship. Library publishing as a profession emerges from this intersection, and many professionals in library publishing enter the career through work in academic or public libraries; academic and scholarly publishing, including but not limited to university presses; digital humanities; or other related careers.

The LPC's Library Publishing Competencies (LPC Professional Development Committee, 2020) provides a list of skills and knowledge useful in the development and provision of publishing services in libraries, organized into three categories: publishing, program development and management, and teaching and consulting.

Roles and careers in library publishing vary widely, and as with other publishing professions, job titles and roles can frequently vary widely between one institution and another. At many institutions, a Master of Library and Information Science (MLIS) degree may be required, while other institutions will accept an equivalent degree such as a Master's in Publishing or a graduate degree in another field. For some positions, a bachelor's degree may be the only requirement, although advancing in the field may be a challenge without a graduate degree in a related field.

The Library Publishing Coalition Job Board lists current openings in the field. Possible titles and roles might include:

- Digital Publishing Specialist
- Institutional Repository Librarian
- Open Scholarship Librarian
- Publishing Services Specialist
- Scholarly Communication Librarian
- Associate University Librarian for Publishing, Preservation, Research, and Digital Access

## Learning About Library Publishing

Librarians and publishers have traditionally learned scholarly publishing practices on the job, when they are already in the midst of needing to know how publishing works. Librarians in solo publishing units might rely on available learning materials such as this curriculum, Public Knowledge Project (PKP) School, and the Open Education Network's Open Textbook Publishing Orientation (PUB 101), as well as connections to other knowledgeable practitioners through professional associations and conferences. The Library Publishing Curriculum, for instance, was created to provide training and resources to those entering the field from related disciplines, those without a background in publishing or librarianship, and those considering the field as a profession.

As librarians have learned how to become publishers, they have started to train other librarians and students through professional development workshops and events (like the Library Publishing Forum) and student internships. In addition, library and information science programs have begun to offer a few scholarly communication classes that occasionally focus on library publishing—though as of 2022, these classes are still few and far between. When this disciplinary work is taught, either through formal (coursework and workshops) or informal (internships) mechanisms, it is sometimes referred to as *publishing pedagogy*, which acknowledges that there is both a disciplinary framework *and* a practical application to library publishing that can be taught through project-based work where the learner works in a hands-on fashion on a publishing project (i.e., open educational resources, open-access journal, digital humanities project, etc.) while learning in a concerted fashion about how publishing roles, processes, workflows, and theories apply to those specific projects.

## Library Publishing as a Research Discipline

As library publishing has become established as a subfield within libraries, many practitioners have undertaken scholarly research to advance the field through evidence-based practice. Library publishing

research methods are largely qualitative and praxis-based, often consisting of case studies and surveys, with less in the way of statistical or quantitative methods.

The LPC presents an annual Award for Outstanding Scholarship in Library Publishing to celebrate and encourage research, theory, and innovative practice. The LPC has also developed a Library Publishing Research Agenda highlighting topics which could benefit from future research in the field, along with examples of published research that can be used as a starting point when embarking on research in these areas. The Research Agenda topics offer a good indication of trends in the existing literature as well as areas for further research: Assessment, Labor, Accessibility, Non-Traditional Research Outputs, Peer Review, and Partnerships.

### **Journals in Publishing**

There are a number of scholarly publishing and library science journals that include peer-reviewed articles and discussions on library publishing, open access, and other issues. Check your institution's library for access, as ironically many of them are *not* openly available.

The *Journal of Librarianship and Scholarly Communication* is an important journal focused on libraries as publisher, library-press partnerships, open access, and policy issues related to library publishing and scholarly communication. Publishing-specific journals include *Learned Publishing*, *Journal of Scholarly Publishing*, *Journal of Electronic Publishing*, *Publications*, *Publishing Research Quarterly*, *Journal of Ethics in Publishing*, and others. Journals in the library science field also include scholarly articles on library publishing, including *College and Research Libraries*, the *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, *Library and Information Science Review*, *Library Quarterly*, and many others. The Scholarly Kitchen blog, while not peer reviewed or dedicated to library publishing, includes blog posts on open access and other issues relevant to library publishing professionals, as does the Library Publishing Coalition's blog.

### **Library Publishing Organizations and Associations**

Library publishing and related organizations and associations offer a number of options for staying connected with others in the field, keeping up-to-date with the latest trends and developments, and sharing your own practices and innovations. See the Introduction Module's Appendix A for a sample of well-known organizations and associations in the library publishing sphere. Many of these organizations host regular conferences and provide email discussion lists and other mechanisms for staying connected with colleagues and learning about the discipline.

## **WHERE ARE WE HEADED IN (LIBRARY) PUBLISHING?**

This section outlines trends that are specific to library publishing as a practice and a discipline. Trends help us see the current and future landscape of libraries and how library publishing fits within (or against) that work. For instance, while a trend such as transformative agreements exists within the larger institutional context of the library, that context typically impacts (and creates exigence for) library publishing units. As a result, some trends and directions listed here are not specific to library publishing but still impact library publishing.

## Publishing as a Radically Inclusive Act

There is nothing intrinsic in library publishing that guarantees inclusive practice, but conceptions of the field are starting to prioritize equitable and inclusive strategies. The Library Publishing Coalition's 2018 *Ethical Framework for Library Publishing* (2018) features Accessibility and Diversity, Equity and Inclusion as top-level categories, an indication that these topics are on the minds of library publishers (LPC Ethical Framework for Library Publishing Task Force, 2018). The Coalition itself has implemented a *Roadmap for Anti-Racist Practice* (LPC Diversity and Inclusion Task Force, 2021), which lays out actions for short-, mid- and long-range goals to ensure that the community enacts these values as fundamental. Library publishing's tendency toward open access can be seen as an indicator that it prioritizes inclusion, though this too is not a guarantee of inclusive practice, a conception thoroughly interrogated in recent scholarship, including Martin Paul Eve and Jonathan Gray's edited volume *Reassembling Scholarly Communications*. Reggie Raju et al. (2020) argue in that collection that equity demands a truly localized and academy-owned library publishing infrastructure, to counteract the globalizing trends that center white, western control of knowledge production and dissemination.

## Academy-Owned Publishing

As scholarly communication has shifted to a digital environment, new tools and platforms have appeared across the research lifecycle to support academics in creating and sharing scholarly works digitally: institutional repositories, pre-print and post-print servers, collaborative writing tools, academic networking sites, etc. Many of these platforms were initially created by the scholarly communities that use them, but over the past decade, there has been an increasingly concerning trend of large, commercial companies (which are often also academic publishers) purchasing and consolidating these platforms and tools to include as part of their suite of offerings for universities. Thus, instead of academic communities owning and controlling their own scholarly infrastructure, universities and individuals are increasingly "renting" these tools, as Alejandro Posada and George Chen (2018) call it, from the very companies they are often meant to subvert. This trend additionally contributes to the oligopoly commercial companies have over the publishing and wider scholarly communication industry, and it further exacerbates the substantial amount of library budgets that go to a handful of companies.

There have been numerous commercial acquisitions of academic platforms over the years that have caused a stir in the academic community, but this issue was brought to the forefront in 2017 when commercial publisher Elsevier announced that it had purchased bepress, a company which provided a hosted repository, journal publishing, and academic profile solution used by many universities for their institutional repositories. This acquisition sparked new calls for universities to take control over their own infrastructure and to be more deliberate about their investments in scholarly infrastructure. For example, "beprexit" is one university's response to Elsevier's announcement ("Penn Libraries to End Partnership with Bepress," 2017). Terms like "academy-owned," "academy-led," and "community-aligned" (see Schlosser & Mitchell, 2019) have been used to describe providers of scholarly infrastructure and their relationship to libraries and academics. These terms are often meant to indicate alignment with core library values, such as openness and interoperability, which are not always shared by commercial players (see SPARC & Confederation of Open Access Repositories, n.d.).



## Transformative Agreements

Transformative agreements (TAs) describe a range of approaches to funding open-access publication that share the feature of flipping the traditional funding model for scholarly publishing to paying for publication rather than (simply) for subscription. Transformative agreements are also called read-and-publish agreements, and they have been imagined since roughly 2014, when the Max Planck Society proposed that the total money in the scholarly publishing ecosystem was sufficient to make all work openly available on the front end (Schimmer et al., 2015). As currently implemented, TAs replace former “big deal” agreements between academic libraries and commercial scholarly publishers, which secured electronic access to a bundle of research literature for the institutions’ readers. In the transformative agreement model, some portion of the Big Deal cost is reapportioned to pay the article processing charges (APCs) for any of the institutions’ researchers who publish in the publisher’s journals. This reapportionment results in open-access publication of the institution’s research output and helps the institution avoid paying twice for the same research (once to produce it, a second time to access it). Many academic institutions and governments have signed these agreements in the late 2010s, though this period has also seen a number of high-profile institutions decline to sign any agreement with the largest commercial scholarly publishers (University of California, significantly, ended their Big Deal and refused to sign a TA with Elsevier). Such a move by the U.S.’s largest university block suggests that appetite for TAs is fading.

In the European Union, Coalition-S has been organized by funders to demand that the research they fund be made openly available, either via deposit in an open repository or publication in a fully open-access journal. The comprehensive coverage of funding agencies across Europe ensures that this approach, called Plan S, will have a significant impact on the open-access landscape in European research. The restriction on allowed outlets is targeted to change publisher behavior toward open access: The disallowing of hybrid journals as an acceptable outlet means that transformative agreements won’t by themselves satisfy the requirements of the funders. The alternative outlet of open repositories (i.e., green open access) suggests a strategy to finally break commercial scholarly publishers’ ever-shifting approach to author deposit policies: Publishers who want access to European researchers can either embrace fully open publishing or embrace fully green open access. The full implementation of Plan S is yet to mature as of the time of this writing, and future analysis is necessary to determine the success of this funding strategy.

## Open Peer Review

Open review can take many forms, but publications that employ it typically have a few goals in common. These goals include demystifying the review process by removing it from the black box created by editor-controlled anonymous processes; shifting the emphasis in the process from the summative (determining whether a text is “good enough” to be published) to the formative (focusing on ways to make the text as strong as it can be); and fostering critical conversations that are productive not only of good work but of community.

The openness of open review differs significantly from one publication to another, depending on its community's needs. One publication might choose to drop the veil of anonymity between author and reviewers but maintain the routing of their conversation through an editor. Another might elect to place authors and reviewers in direct conversation with one another, while keeping their communication private, either permanently or until the publication is finalized. Others might make the review process visible to a community, or even fully public, while continuing to rely on selected reviewers. And some might opt to open the review process to contributions from any interested reader.

The development of an open review process can and should be in dialogue with the community of practice's values. For one group of scholars, conversation with the world beyond the academy might be paramount; for another, conversation among scholarly peers with a concern for the security of early-career researchers might take precedence. The key to open review is its generative, collaborative ethos, and its particulars should be focused on the best means of supporting the specific community's goals.

New platforms in digital publishing, many of which are in connection with library–press partnerships, offer open review features through annotation. These include Manifold and PubPub, among others in development. Annotation options in these systems can create, in structured ways, opportunities for more types of review, thus broadening the way research is channeled through previously closed systems.

## Open Pedagogy

Library publishing presents an opportunity to involve students in the creation of publishing projects through open pedagogy. Open pedagogy refers to projects that involve students in the production—rather than simply the consumption—of knowledge. Open pedagogy projects invite students to move beyond the “disposable assignment,” a term coined by David Wiley to describe assignments that are created for a grade, seen only by a course instructor, and then thrown away (2013). Instead, open pedagogy projects involve students in openly sharing and contributing to knowledge in a public and enduring way. Involving students in the publishing process also provides an educational opportunity where students can explore issues of intellectual property, copyright, and open access, and get hands-on experience with writing for publication and participating in peer review. Library publishing programs can support open pedagogy by providing opportunities for students to participate in publishing projects both within and beyond their classrooms.

Some examples of open pedagogy involve students creating course content within a classroom, resulting in a new OER for future student use. Other examples involve students creating digital (humanities) projects, such as collections or informational resource websites. In these open pedagogy examples, students learn course content while also learning about publishing, and the instructor and students collaborate with the library, often through the publishing librarian or the digital humanities librarian (and sometimes those are the same person) to produce a preservable project. For more on publishing pedagogy, see the “Careers in Library Publishing” and “Library Publishing as a Research Discipline” sections in the Introduction Module for more on publishing pedagogy.

## Trending Genres and Formats

The last decade has witnessed a rise in the types of publications library publishers encounter, and we have listed as many of them here as we know about.

### eBooks

eBooks in the library publishing context generally refer to scholarly monographs whereas OER (discussed later) refer to pedagogical textbooks. While eBooks are by no means a new publication medium, the ways in which they are being published, disseminated, and acquired are rapidly changing and expanding. Over the last decade, there has been a significant increase in the number of eBooks published, especially via library publishing programs and university presses. In particular, eBooks are much more frequently being published with integrated media, taking advantage of the affordances many publishing and hosting platforms offer, such as in the academy-owned eBook platforms Fulcrum and Manifold, in an effort for library publishers and presses to create a digital-first frontlist of content. Most of the eBooks published in these platforms are open-access (see the “Academy-Owned Publishing” section in the Introduction Module for more on open-source software). Additionally, there have been increased efforts to digitize and convert older, backlist content from university presses to eBooks (both in PDF and EPUB formats) in collaboration with library publishing partners who help maintain and preserve this older content, allowing it to live anew for a new set of audiences.

More and more direct-to-library eBook models have been emerging, and as of late, these models increasingly provide open access. This is largely in response to the effects of the very immediate need to turn to online teaching and learning at the start of the pandemic in March 2020, resulting in a greater urgency for access to digital (and openly accessible) scholarship. As more and more publishers shift to publishing open eBooks, there will be an even greater focus placed on issues of accessibility, preservation, discoverability, as well as equity, inclusion, and diversity. Currently, there are many different standards and norms when it comes to the file formats of eBooks, how they are distributed through discovery networks, and how they are hosted, preserved, and read. This shift towards a more open eBook environment certainly invites a greater interrogation and revision of these standards and workflows so that eBooks can be more broadly accessed.

The inherent trajectory of eBook production tends to arise from within university presses, often those that are partnered with library publishers (see the Introduction Module’s “Where Library Publishing Takes Place” section for various partnership models), whereas OER tend to arise from library publishers exclusively. University presses focus on monographs and do not publish textbooks as a general rule. This framework may need interrogating as eBooks and OER continue to rise and partnerships between presses and libraries become stronger.

### Open Educational Resources

In the last decade, Open Educational Resources (OER) have enjoyed tremendous growth and acceptance among higher education faculty. This is largely thanks to librarians, who have been integral to inspiring OER interest and acceptance as a strategy for addressing inequity in higher education. OER are teaching,

learning, and research materials that are either (a) in the public domain or (b) licensed in a manner that provides everyone with free and perpetual permission to engage in the 5R activities known as Retain, Reuse, Revise, Remix, and Redistribute (see the “What Role Does Open Access Play?” section in the Introduction Module for more on the 5R activities). When faculty assign OER, students have free access to their course materials from day one.

While OER is a broad term that is inclusive of a variety of materials, much of the early programmatic focus has been on open textbooks. That’s because commercial textbooks are often expensive for students and because faculty are already familiar with the textbook adoption process. Primarily for these reasons, libraries usually focus first on supporting OER adoption. Then, perhaps several years later in their OER programs, they develop OER publishing support.

Often it’s just one person managing an OER publishing program. However, these individuals are cumulatively creating a wealth of OER. As one illustration of their collective impact, in 2012 the Open Textbook Library, a comprehensive collection of open textbooks, included 84 records. Ten years later it includes more than 1,000. This is a direct reflection of the work librarians have been doing to support faculty in publishing OER.

Today, many academic libraries are actively defining their OER publishing support to reflect their institutional context and resources. There are many questions to answer, including what services may capitalize on librarians’ established skillsets, like copyright guidance, and what may be potentially outsourced, like copyediting. There are also questions about sustainability.

In a global context, a study of Brazilian libraries by Celia Rosa (personal communication, March 2022) indicates that only 14.6% perform tasks related to the progress of digital books and OER. If compared to the work of journals, it highlights that books—despite being so important for the humanities—still occupy a place of disarray in the face of structured science communication through articles. Among many questions, where to start this work of creating incentives with professors for the publication of books in a South American context, perhaps, is to offer more roadmaps that demystify this specific publishing ecosystem across and between libraries.

## **Multimedia Publishing**

Increasingly humanities researchers are creating scholarly products outside the traditional formats of monograph and journal article. These scholarly products include (but are not limited to) digital collections and exhibitions, tools and methods for data analysis, media-intensive web-based publications, and OER that don’t follow a typical PDF or print-textbook model. Sometimes these publications are referred to as digital humanities projects, enhanced monographs (see also the “eBooks” section above), interactive books, or other names. A common motivation for these efforts is public engagement and an ethic of access—to grow public audiences and to make the building blocks of scholarly inquiry accessible to many. The experimental nature of these projects together with their public-mindedness naturally lead researchers to seek to publish them using their home institution’s technical infrastructure. Academic libraries, in collaboration with campus information technology, increasingly offer some measure of support. Depending upon staffing levels and expertise within a

particular academic library, that support might include project planning and development, referral to third-party web publishing platforms, in-house provision of server space or standard platforms for web publishing, as well as in-house first-of-its-kind software development (see the “Academy-Owned Publishing” section in the Introduction Module).

## CONCLUSION

We hope that the Introduction Module opens the conversation on library publishing for new students, librarians, administrators, and others whose work life is impacted by the many and quick changes happening in library publishing over the last decade. Providing an argument for *why* library publishing is needed, the first section of this narrative helps articulate that library publishing is an extension of our existing work, helps abate the serials crisis and transformative agreements, and through radical reimagining of our intellectual, teaching, and service work as librarians and library publishers, helps us carry out the educational and research missions of our universities in everyday ways. The lengthening history of this field that has become a research discipline and a career provides provenance and exigence for the work we do, including and especially the need for more accessible, inclusive, and diverse voices and scholarship that library publishing units (sometimes in partnership with university presses) are best situated to provide within universities. Key throughout our work is the role of open access—making publishing openly available to as many people as possible is at the heart of library publishing’s mission. But that, too, must be done with critical thought and acknowledgement that not everything needs to or should be open to all, and it’s especially important to remember this in relation to some of the oppressed, underrepresented, and indigenous communities we serve. Library publishing is headed in some exciting and expanding directions, and we hope that this introduction offers a brief glimpse into that work, much of which is expanded on in existing modules. We encourage readers to check out (or return to) the modules on Content, Impact, Policies, and Sustainability to find ways to deepen your library publishing practice in meaningful and inclusive ways.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

AAUP Library Relations Committee. (2013). Press and library collaboration survey (pp. 1–35). The Association of American University Presses. <https://aupresses.org/resources/library-press-collaboration-survey/>

ALA Council. (2019). Core values of librarianship. American Library Association. <https://www.ala.org/advocacy/advocacy/intfreedom/corevalues>

ALA Office for Research & Statistics, ALA Office for Diversity, Literacy and Outreach Services, & Decision Demographics. (2007). Diversity counts (9c324eea-5b83-e7d4-0d00-5dbbf795d076). American Library Association (ALA). <https://www.ala.org/aboutala/offices/diversity/diversitycounts/divcounts>

- Alperin, J. P., Muñoz Nieves, C., Schimanski, L. A., Fischman, G. E., Niles, M. T., & McKiernan, E. C. (2019). How significant are the public dimensions of faculty work in review, promotion and tenure documents? *eLife*, 8, e42254. <https://doi.org/10.7554/eLife.42254>
- Cagle, L. E., Eble, M. F., Gonzales, L., Johnson, M. A., Johnson, N. R., Jones, N. N., Lane, L., Mckoy, T., Moore, K. R., Reynoso, R., Rose, E. J., Patterson, Gp., Sánchez, F., Shivers-McNair, A., Simmons, M., Stone, E. M., Tham, J., Walton, R., & Williams, M. F. (2021). Anti-racist scholarly reviewing practices: A heuristic for editors, reviewers, and authors. <https://tinyurl.com/reviewheuristic>
- Chan, L., Cuplinskas, D., Eisen, M., Friend, F., Foundation, Y. G. N. P., Guédon, J.-C., Hagemann, M., Harnad, S., Johnson, R., Kupryte, R., Manna, M. L., Rév, I., Segbert, M., Souza, S. de, Suber, P., & Velterop, J. (2002). Budapest open access initiative. <https://www.budapestopenaccessinitiative.org/read/>
- Grudniewicz, A., Moher, D., Cobey, K. D., Bryson, G. L., Cukier, S., Allen, K., Ardern, C., Balcom, L., Barros, T., Berger, M., Ciro, J. B., Cugusi, L., Donaldson, M. R., Egger, M., Graham, I. D., Hodgkinson, M., Khan, K. M., Mabizela, M., Manca, A., ... Lalu, M. M. (2019). Predatory journals: No definition, no defence. *Nature*, 576(7786), 210–212. <https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-019-03759-y>
- Hagemann, M. (2012, February 13). Ten years on, researchers embrace open access. Open Society Foundations | Voices. <https://www.opensocietyfoundations.org/voices/ten-years-on-researchers-embrace-open-access>
- IFLA Library Publishing Special Interest Group. (n.d.). Global library publishing map. Retrieved May 2, 2022, from <https://lib-pub.org/>
- Inefuku, H. W. (2021). Relegated to the margins: Faculty of color, the scholarly record, and the necessity of antiracist library disruptions. In S. Y. Leung & J. R. López-McKnight (Eds.), *Knowledge Justice: Disrupting Library and Information Studies through Critical Race Theory* (pp. 197-216.). The MIT Press. <https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/11969.001.0001>
- Jain, V. K., Iyengar, Karthikeyan. P., & Vaishya, R. (2020). Article processing charge may be a barrier to publishing. *Journal of Clinical Orthopaedics and Trauma*, 14, 14–16. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcot.2020.10.039>
- Kairos Editorial Board. (n.d.). Editorial board and review process. *Kairos: A Journal of Rhetoric, Technology, and Pedagogy*. Retrieved May 2, 2022, from <https://kairos.technorhetoric.net/board.html>
- Kelly, J., Sadeghieh, T., & Adeli, K. (2014). Peer review in scientific publications: Benefits, critiques, & a survival guide. *The Journal of the International Federation of Clinical Chemistry and Laboratory Medicine*, 25(3), 227–243.

- Lee & Low Books. (2020, January 28). Where is the diversity in publishing? The 2019 Diversity Baseline Survey results. Lee & Low Books: The Open Book Blog.  
<https://blog.leeandlow.com/2020/01/28/2019diversitybaselinesurvey/>
- Library Publishing Coalition Directory Committee. (2022). Library publishing directory. Library Publishing Coalition. <https://librarypublishing.org/lp-directory/>
- Lippincott, S. K. (2017). Library as publisher: New models of scholarly communication for a new era. Against the Grain, LLC. <http://hdl.handle.net/2027/spo.mpub9944345>
- LPC Diversity and Inclusion Task Force. (2021). Roadmap for anti-racist practice. Library Publishing Coalition. <https://librarypublishing.org/roadmap-for-anti-racist-practice/>
- LPC Ethical Framework for Library Publishing Task Force. (2018). An ethical framework for library publishing, version 1.0. Library Publishing Coalition. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5703/1288284316777>
- LPC Professional Development Committee. (2020). Library publishing competencies. Library Publishing Coalition. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5703/1288284317123>
- Penn Libraries to end partnership with bepress. (2017, October 9). Operation Beprexit.  
<https://beprexit.wordpress.com/official-statement/>
- Posada, A., & Chen, G. (2018). Inequality in knowledge production: The integration of academic infrastructure by big publishers. In L. Chan & P. Mounier (Eds.), *ELPUB 2018: Vol. Connecting the Knowledge Commons: From Projects to Sustainable Infrastructure* (pp. 1–21). Association Francophone d'Interaction Homme-Machine (AFIHM).  
<https://doi.org/10.4000/proceedings.elpub.2018.30>
- Raju, R., Claassen, J., Madini, N., & Suliaman, T. (2020). Social justice and inclusivity: Drivers for the dissemination of african scholarship. In M. P. Eve & J. Gray (Eds.), *Reassembling Scholarly Communications: Histories, Infrastructures, and Global Politics of Open Access* (pp. 53–64). The MIT Press. <https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/11885.003.0008>
- Roh, C., & Inefuku, H. W. (2016). Agents of diversity and social justice: Librarians, institutional repositories, and library publishing. In K. L. Smith & K. A. Dickson (Eds.), *Open Access and the Future of Scholarly Communication: Policy and Infrastructure* (pp. 107–128). Rowman & Littlefield.
- Roh, C., Inefuku, H. W., & Drabinski, E. (2020). Scholarly communications and social justice. In M. P. Eve & J. Gray (Eds.), *Reassembling Scholarly Communications: Histories, Infrastructures, and Global Politics of Open Access* (pp. 41–52). The MIT Press.  
<https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/11885.001.0001>

- Schimmer, R., Geschuhn, K. K., & Vogler, A. (2015). Disrupting the subscription journals' business model for the necessary large-scale transformation to open access. *ScienceOpen Research*.  
<https://doi.org/10.14293/S2199-1006.1.SOR-EDU.AJRG23.v1>
- Schlosser, M., & Mitchell, C. (2019, February 6). Academy-owned? Academic-led? Community-led? What's at stake in the words we use to describe new publishing paradigms. *Library Publishing Coalition Blog*. <https://librarypublishing.org/alpd19-academy-owned-academic-led-community-led/>
- Schonfeld, R. C., & Sweeney, L. (2017). Inclusion, diversity, and equity: Members of the Association of Research Libraries: Employee demographics and director perspectives. *Ithaka S+R*.  
<https://doi.org/10.18665/sr.304524>
- Skinner, K., Lippincott, S., Speer, J., & Walters, T. (2014). Library-as-publisher: Capacity building for the library publishing subfield. *Journal of Electronic Publishing*, 17(2).  
<https://doi.org/10.3998/3336451.0017.207>
- SPARC. (n.d.). Big deal cancellation tracking. Retrieved May 2, 2022, from <https://sparcopen.org/our-work/big-deal-cancellation-tracking/>
- SPARC & Confederation of Open Access Repositories. (n.d.). Good practice principles for scholarly communication services. Retrieved May 2, 2022, from <https://sparcopen.org/our-work/good-practice-principles-for-scholarly-communication-services/>
- Stanley, C. A. (2007). When counter narratives meet master narratives in the journal editorial-review process. *Educational Researcher*, 36(1), 14–24.
- Suber, P. (2012). *Open access*. MIT Press. <https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/9286.001.0001>
- Wiley, D. (2013, October 21). What is open pedagogy? *Improving Learning*.  
<https://opencontent.org/blog/archives/2975>