

3-12-2012

# Library Publishing Services: Strategies for Success: Final Research Report (March 2012)

James L. Mullins

*Purdue University*, [jmullins@purdue.edu](mailto:jmullins@purdue.edu)

Catherine Murray-Rust

*Georgia Institute of Technology - Main Campus*, [catherine.murray-rust@library.gatech.edu](mailto:catherine.murray-rust@library.gatech.edu)

Joyce L. Ogburn

*University of Utah*, [joyce.ogburn@utah.edu](mailto:joyce.ogburn@utah.edu)

Raym Crow

*Chain Bridge Group*, [crow@chainbridgegroup.com](mailto:crow@chainbridgegroup.com)

October Ivins

*Ivins e-Content Solutions*, [october.ivins@mindspring.com](mailto:october.ivins@mindspring.com)

*See next page for additional authors*

Follow this and additional works at: [http://docs.lib.purdue.edu/purduepress\\_ebooks](http://docs.lib.purdue.edu/purduepress_ebooks)

---

## Recommended Citation

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

This document has been made available through Purdue e-Pubs, a service of the Purdue University Libraries. Please contact [epubs@purdue.edu](mailto:epubs@purdue.edu) for additional information.

---

**Authors**

James L. Mullins, Catherine Murray-Rust, Joyce L. Ogburn, Raym Crow, October Ivins, Allyson Mower, Daureen Nesdill, Mark Newton, Julie Speer, and Charles Watkinson





---

## FOREWORD

Libraries have a deeply ingrained mission to promote the creation and diffusion of knowledge and to preserve it for the long term. We offer exceptional services to scholars and students who employ diverse means of exploration, explication, and expression of their scholarship. Librarians are compelled to take on whatever roles serve these ends, though they may stretch our organizations and create new demands on our resources. The mission of academic libraries has not changed, but the means of fulfilling it has.

It is now apparent to academic library deans and directors that recent trends, developments, and needs have converged to suggest new roles and responsibilities for libraries. Academic libraries and their institutions have made substantial investments in digital repositories and in the promotion of models for more open scholarship, and these continue to engender faculty resoluteness through open access resolutions and campus policies. The barrier to entry for newcomers to digital publishing continues to drop with advancements in community-developed open source software, while the trend toward deeper institutional integration between libraries and university presses accelerates, forming new partnerships to serve the publishing goals of local researchers. Meanwhile, campus communities, both the underserved and those eager to experiment with new digital publishing and preservation options, are finding new sources of support in the library community. That many libraries have bravely seized this opportunity to initiate new publishing services was borne out through several key reports in the latter part of the last decade. How have these pioneering programs fared, and is the recognition of a compelling need for library-based publishing services growing across institutions of higher learning?

To begin to answer these questions, in the spring of 2010 three university libraries began a collaboration to explore the future of new publishing models based within academic libraries. The libraries of Purdue University, Georgia Institute of Technology, and the University of Utah had particular and complementary experience and expertise in three publishing areas: Purdue in open access journals; Georgia Tech in conference proceedings; and Utah in monographic publications. To advance their joint initiative each

institution agreed that additional research was necessary, to include a survey of the state of library publishing in the country as a whole, building on earlier work that focused exclusively on Association of Research Libraries members. The proposal created to research this question was submitted to the Institute for Museum and Library Services (IMLS) as a Collaborative Planning Grant in its National Leadership Grant (NLG) Program.

The work of the grant began in the fall of 2010 and the results of this study now inform the larger academic library community beyond the members of the Association of Research Libraries, the Oberlin Group, and the University Libraries Group (and later the Affinity Group) who eagerly volunteered to participate in this project. Our preliminary findings have sparked dialogue in multiple discussion forums, in digital library workshops, in our trade publications, and among the astute bloggers and commenters across our library community.

We three deans are convinced that the time has come to use the evidence of growth of and demand for publishing services to make the critical, difficult decisions necessary to foster and continue this work. To follow our lead, this means specifically:

- » reallocating funds from the existing library budget to serve faculty and institutional publishing needs that a local, campus-based publishing partner can address;
- » committing to professional development for existing staff and to filling new library-publishing positions with personnel who bring perspective and competencies drawn from multiple professions;
- » investing in senior program leaders, with resources and organizational empowerment to grow our programs in the face of potentially stiff institutional bureaucracy and criticism against these investments in a period of financial austerity;
- » aligning the value in our new publishing services with the strategic goals of the academic library and its home institution by diving head-first into open access business models and fee-based service provision, among other challenging propositions;
- » treating academic publishing support as a holistic endeavor and assuming responsibility for acquiring a comprehensive understanding of editor and author needs, along with the suite of value propositions proffered by traditional academic publishers; and further

» leveraging existing partnerships with university presses to meet requirements beyond mere software and content hosting and bare-bones staffing that have characterized some of our earliest forays into providing publishing services.

The recommendations of the report and the recorded opinions and lessons shared with us by enterprising library publishing programs will catalyze further development and professionalization. Although we are all experimenting in our unique contexts, we share a common interest in serving the emergent needs of our patrons—we must not do so in our respective silos. The desire to come together as a community rang out loud and clear throughout the study, and our national organizations and associations must propel the coalescing, cross-institutional interests that were identified through the whole-hearted participation of so many diverse academic libraries. Notwithstanding, further articulation of the important role in the scholarly communication ecosystem for library-publishing operations remains an equally pressing need. With data, anecdote, observation, and case study in hand, the time is now for us to stand together, make a definitive statement, and take concerted action.

*James L. Mullins, Dean of Libraries, Purdue University*

*Catherine Murray-Rust, Dean of Libraries, Georgia Institute of Technology*

*Joyce L. Ogburn, Dean of the J. Willard Marriott Library and University*

*Librarian, University of Utah*

*Note:* Although the three library deans (Mullins, Murray-Rust, and Ogburn) were the PI and co-PIs respectively, librarians and press staff at the universities and the consultants performed most of the work. The deans wish to acknowledge the effort of all who coordinated this project, and especially (in alphabetical order) Bill Anderson, Raym Crow, Sara Fuchs, October Ivins, Judy Luther, Allyson Mower, Daureen Nesdill, Mark Newton, Julie Speer, and Charles Watkinson. We also thank the many respondents to the survey and the participants in the workshops, all of whom shared their time and expertise. Institutions who participated in the survey are listed at the end of this report.





## INTRODUCTION

Over the past five years, libraries have begun to expand their role in the scholarly publishing value chain by offering a greater range of pre-publication and editorial support services. Given the rapid evolution of these services, there is a clear community need for practical guidance concerning the challenges and opportunities facing library-based publishing programs.

Recognizing that library publishing services represent one part of a complex ecology of scholarly communication, Purdue University Libraries, in collaboration with the Libraries of Georgia Institute of Technology and the University of Utah, secured an IMLS National Leadership Grant under the title “Library Publishing Services: Strategies for Success.” The project, conducted primarily between October 2010 and September 2011, sought to advance the professionalism of library-based publishing by identifying successful library publishing strategies and services, highlighting best practices, and recommending priorities for building capacity.

The project had four components: 1) a survey of librarians designed to provide an overview of current practice for library publishing programs; 2) a report presenting best practice case studies of the publishing programs at the partner institutions; 3) a series of workshops held at each participating institution to present and discuss the findings of the survey and case studies; and 4) a review of the existing literature on library publishing services. The results of these research threads are pulled together in this brief research report.

## THE LIBRARY SURVEY

To gain a broader perspective on current library publishing practice, the project surveyed library directors at institutions of various types and sizes, including members of the Association of Research Libraries (ARL), Oberlin Group, and University Library Group institutions (later also members of the Affinity Group). The survey, described more fully online at <http://wp.sparc.arl.org/lps>, aimed to identify the types of library publishing services currently being offered and to obtain a fuller understanding of the strategic and

operating issues relevant to such programs.<sup>1</sup> Only respondents representing institutions with operational publishing service programs were offered a full set of survey questions. As a result, the survey analysis reflects responses received from approximately 43 libraries.

The survey, which was conducted in October and November of 2010, was designed to allow a longitudinal comparison with a previous survey of ARL members on library publishing services (Hahn 2008).<sup>2</sup>

Key findings of the survey include:

- » Approximately half (55%) of respondents indicated having, or being interested in, offering library publishing services. Interest in such services varied by institution size, with over three-quarters of ARLs being interested, compared to 30% of Oberlin Group institutions. Most libraries with existing programs anticipated increasing the program's scale or scope in the next year.
- » About three-quarters of the programs publish between one and six journals, the majority of which are only distributed electronically and are less than three-years old. About half of the programs publish conference proceedings, technical reports, or monographs; most often electronically, but with some print-on-demand distribution. Publishing services offered include copyright advice, digitization services, and peer review management.
- » The vast majority of library publishing programs (almost 90%) were launched in order to contribute to change in the scholarly publishing system, supplemented by a variety of other mission-related motivations. The prevalence of mission-driven rationale aligns with the funding sources reported for library publishing programs, including library budget reallocations (97%), temporary funding from the institution (67%), and grant support (57%). However, many respondents expect a greater percentage of future publishing program funding to come from service fees, product revenue, charge-backs, royalties, and other program-generated income.
- » Almost two-thirds of the programs collaborate with one or more other campus units—such as a university press or campus computing—and two-thirds collaborate with individuals or organizations

<sup>1</sup>The survey was conducted under the leadership of consultant October Ivins.

<sup>2</sup>Karla Hahn (2008) Research Library Publishing Services: New Options for University Publishing. Washington DC: ARL (<http://www.arl.org/bm-doc/research-library-publishing-services.pdf>)

outside of the institution. Over half of the respondents expect collaborations to increase in the next year.

» About half of responding institutions centralize management of their publishing activities within one library unit. The number of staff allocated to publishing activities is modest—averaging 2.4 FTE for ARLs and 0.9 FTE for Oberlin Group institutions—with older programs typically being larger. Staff dedicated exclusively to publishing service programs are relatively rare, with responsibility for such services typically fragmented across multiple staff members.

» The perceived relevance of publishing services to the library's mission, and the integration of such services into the library's budget, also helps explain the relative lack of emphasis on sustainability planning revealed by the survey. Few institutions (15%) have a documented sustainability plan for their publishing services, and only a fifth have evaluated the value or effectiveness of their publishing services.

» The most prevalent journal publishing platforms reported were Open Journal Systems (57%), DSpace (36%), and BePress's Digital Commons (25%).

» According to respondents, the three resources most needed for planning or operating a library-based publishing service are guides to business issues, information on publishing platforms, and examples of policy and process documents.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> In May 2011, SPARC released the Open-access Journal Publishing Resource Index (<http://www.arl.org/sparc/partnering/planning/index.shtml>), which addresses some of the needs identified by the survey.



## THE CASE STUDIES

### Overview

The project commissioned an analysis of publishing initiatives at each of the three participating institutions to assess the extent to which those initiatives comply with best practices for sustainability planning.<sup>4</sup> These case studies, reported in further detail online at <http://wp.sparc.arl.org/lps>, provide object lessons that can help inform and guide future planning and implementation of similar library-based publishing programs. The selected initiatives represent the kinds of publishing projects of increasing interest to academic libraries of all sizes:

#### *The Purdue e-Pubs Journal Publishing Services*

The Purdue e-Pubs Journal Publishing Services—a collaboration of the Purdue University Libraries and the Purdue University Press—were launched in 2006 to publish Open Access journals. In 2011 the initiative published ten Open Access journals, six of which are affiliated with departments or schools at Purdue, two of which are student journals, one journal with an internal faculty editor (but not departmental affiliation), and one legacy journal with an external editor.

The e-Pubs program draws resources from both the Library and the Press and aligns with the mission of each unit as well. Both the Library and the Press wish to respond to faculty demand for new publishing venues, especially in interdisciplinary fields. In addition, the Library seeks to provide faculty with non-commercial, Open Access publishing venues, and the Press seeks to align itself more closely with the research, teaching, and outreach focuses of the University.

#### *Georgia Tech Library Conference Proceedings Support Service*

The GT Library Conference Proceedings Support Service provides web hosting and archiving for symposia and conferences

<sup>4</sup> The case studies were conducted by consultant, Raym Crow.

hosted at Georgia Tech. Key client segments include organizers of conferences and symposia at Georgia Tech, as well as clients of the Georgia Tech Global Learning Center. The service focuses on Open Access content, although some conferences have restricted access to their proceedings. Since 2006, the initiative has hosted and/or archived proceedings from almost 20 conferences or workshops. Due to resource constraints, the initiative has had to limit the scope of the services that it provides.

Although initial outreach efforts for the program generated appreciable interest, the Library hesitated to market the services more aggressively out of concern that such efforts would generate more demand than the program could satisfy. This concern was amplified by the extent of *ad hoc* support and customization some clients required.

For its first five years, the initiative has operated informally, funded as part of the Library's standing budget. Now, the Library must decide whether to continue rationing a basic level of service to a small group of campus clients, or to fund expansion of the service's scope and/or broaden its client base by supplementing library funding with a fee-based model.

### *Utah Scholarly Monographs*

As at Purdue, the University of Utah Press has become more tightly integrated into the Library's strategy and operations. Given this integration, the Library and Press are actively exploring various publishing services they might offer to the Utah community. In this context, the Library is seeking to be more systematic and deliberate about mining its special collections and about the role that the Press plays vis-à-vis Library publishing services overall.

The types of publishing services and publishing opportunities under consideration include:

- » Library hosting of online content to complement the Press's scholarly monographs;
- » Library support for online content to supplement the research and publications of Utah faculty, regardless of where (or whether) a print edition is published; and

- » Mining the Library's special collections to identify content that might be:
  - » published in book form by the Press;
  - » distributed free online by the Library, possibly with editorial advice from the Press; and/or
  - » made available in digital and/or print-on-demand formats.

### ***Sustainability Model Components***

To provide a framework for assessing the sustainability plans for the three initiatives, the case study report outlines best practices that apply to developing sustainability models for campus-based publishing programs. The key elements of a sustainability model include:

- » *Audience or client segments*—the various audiences, constituencies, or markets that derive value from the proposed service.

To develop an effective sustainability model, an initiative needs to identify the distinct client segments—each with its specific characteristics and value requirements—that it seeks to serve. Each of these segments needs to be evaluated in terms of the value perceived, demand for the service, and the communications and marketing channels that will be used to reach it. For library publishing programs, the beneficiary of the value being created is not always the principal source of funding. Therefore, both direct beneficiaries and their funding proxies need to be identified.

- » *Value proposition*—the content and/or services that serve the needs of each client segment.

A publishing program's value proposition represents that part of its offering for which a specific client segment is willing to pay. This payment is not confined to financial transactions. In the context of peer-reviewed journals and monographs, for example, it may comprise an author's choosing to publish via the initiative and a researcher's attention in reading the initiative's publication(s). A sustainability model may include one or more value propositions for each of its target client segments, including both direct beneficiaries and their proxies.

» ***Core activities and resources***—the set of activities that an initiative undertakes to provide a service or produce a publication, and to support the income model itself, as well as the resources and partnerships required for the activities.

As far as possible, a program's core activities, and the cost of the resources to support them, need to be aligned with the value proposition and income stream for each client segment. This alignment helps ensure that the program focuses on the most critical activities and allocates resources efficiently across the initiative's activities.

» ***Distribution channels***—the channels through which the initiative reaches its audiences or clients and delivers its value.

A publishing initiative requires distribution channels through which it can reach its audiences and deliver its value. Distribution channels typically entail communication and marketing, as the value that an initiative delivers must be communicated clearly and explicitly to the client segment(s) expected to pay for it. This is true for grants and other subsidies, as well as for earned revenue models.

» ***Income streams***—the mechanisms by which an initiative actually generates income—including, potentially, both earned revenue and subsidies—from the clients to which it delivers value.

Depending on the type of service or publication offered, income streams can include in-kind or cash subsidies, service or publication fees, voluntary use fees, grants and donations, advertising, sponsorships, secondary licensing fees, endowment interest, and other sources. An initiative may require multiple income streams to sustain itself, and generating income from multiple sources can add stability to an initiative's revenue base.

The financial potential and stability of any funding model, whether based on earned revenue or subsidies, are functions of how well the above elements are integrated. The value delivered must be recognized by the client segments that benefit from it, and the resources (whether in-kind or financial) generated by the funding models must be allocated to those activities critical to generating the initiative's value. Further, because all of the above components are interrelated, a strong sustainability model should be integral to an initiative's conception and design. Regardless of whether the model involves subsidies, market-based income, or both, planning for sustainability from the outset typically yields a funding model with greater stability and longevity than one introduced after the initiative has been launched.



---

## THE WORKSHOPS

### Overview

Three consultative workshops, held in May 2011 at Georgia Tech, the University of Utah, and Purdue University, expanded the perspective and enriched the information gathered by the project survey and reported in the case studies. As described further online at <http://wp.sparc.arl.org/lps>, workshop participants represented North American libraries of all sizes and library publishing programs of various types and stages of development. Workshop participants were chosen based on their practical experience implementing publishing programs, or because of their interest in establishing such a program.

Each workshop featured sessions covering five issues central to building library publishing programs: technology infrastructure, policies and processes, skills and training, program planning and sustainability models, and organization and collaboration. The workshops were structured to highlight challenges confronting library publishing programs, identify community priorities, and develop recommendations for resources and collective action to improve results and accelerate progress.

Workshop presentations from library publishing programs indicated demand for both traditional journal and monographic support, as well as for new, alternative modes of scholarly communication. The former includes peer reviewed journals, monographs, and conference proceedings, and the latter includes non-linear monograph narrative structures, subject- or theme-specific web resources.

Not surprisingly, the presentations and discussions reflected a tension between author and editor demands for traditional publishing services—including copyediting, workflow management, and indexing—and typical library skill sets and library desire to avoid reproducing the infrastructure and costs of conventional publishing operations. Indeed, many institutions are experiencing demand to support both traditional and innovative publishing models simultaneously, expanding the types of expertise required and straining resources further.

Workshop participants also discussed other key differences between traditional publishing models and library-based publishing programs, including: 1) a dominant philosophical preference for open access dissemination; 2) a willingness to engage with the entire research lifecycle, from assistance with data management to final preservation; and 3) a tolerance for, and interest in, experimental new forms of scholarly communication.

### ***Technology Infrastructure***

The principal publishing platforms indicated in the survey and represented in the workshops—PKP’s Open Journal Systems and Open Conference Systems and BePress’s Digital Commons—reflect different technology management approaches. OJS’s open source software is typically implemented, hosted, and maintained locally as a premise-based solution, while Digital Commons provides a centrally hosted and maintained proprietary service. The type of solution a given library chooses typically depends on the institution’s size, technical capacity, and resource management strategy.

A number of participants indicated an interest in a collective solution—for example, a shared hosting platform for the OJS/OCS software—that would deliver cost benefits and service flexibility, while allowing their libraries to focus their staff resources on content acquisition, presentation, and preservation.

### ***Policies & Processes***

As the scale and scope of library publishing services increase, the need for internal and external policies becomes more pronounced. Internal policies include a program’s strategic objectives, the budget within which it operates, the principal audience(s) served, editorial parameters, and the types of services offered.

External policies—for example, formal agreements that articulate the responsibilities of both a library and its publishing partners—help ensure the editorial quality and performance of library-hosted publications. These policies are often captured in service level agreements or memoranda of understanding. As the workshop discussions revealed (and the case studies documented), clearly articulated internal objectives and external policies are necessary to manage a publishing program rationally.

Workshop discussions considered the types of policies developed by various programs, and confirmed the benefits of a centralized exchange for sharing policies and process documents, such as that provided by the SPARC Campus-based Publishing Resource (<http://www.arl.org/sparc/partnering>).

## ***Skills & Training***

Library publishing programs—many of which offer skeletal production systems and minimal editorial support—have discovered that authors and editors continue to demand publishing services that the library had assumed to be irrelevant in an era of digital dissemination. The skills that these publishing services require do not always align well with traditional library staff expertise, requiring libraries to either hire staff with publishing experience or to seek training for existing staff.

Workshop participants discussed the lack of publishing training in library schools, and identified XML production workflows and project management to be areas where the need for training is particularly acute. The workshops identified specialized publishing tracks within MLS and LIS programs as one possible response to the need for greater professional training, as well as less formal information sharing events to provide training on tools, processes, and best practices (e.g., THATCamp publishing).

Participants from institutions of all sizes reported the challenges and benefits of undergraduate and graduate student labor. Although nominally less costly, student labor becomes more expensive when the inefficiency of constant turnover, increased management requirements, and duplicative training are factored in. However, participants reported on the value of student involvement with publications on an institution's curriculum and information literacy initiatives.

## ***Sustainability Planning***

In the workshop sessions on sustainability planning, much of the discussion centered on the relevance of such planning (and of best practices drawn from product and market management) for mission-driven publishing programs. Although some librarians remain apprehensive of best practices derived from business experience, most participants recognized (at least, in theory) the value and benefits delivered by careful sustainability planning from the outset of a program.

The need for deliberate sustainability planning has been muted somewhat, especially for smaller and newer publishing programs, by the consciously experimental nature of many library publishing programs. However, the workshop discussions indicated that as such programs grow and mature—and as the extent of the resources required to sustain them increase—libraries have begun to seek new sources of funding to supplement the library budget subsidy. Further, the need to justify a growing allocation of library resources has increased the importance of demonstrating the value library publishing programs deliver, especially to their host institutions. Demonstrating this value requires a variety of qualitative indicators and quantitative metrics. Some of the former can be adapted from existing library program evaluation practices, while the latter remain to be more fully developed and refined.

The relevance of fee-based service models proved of particular interest to workshop participants from programs where current resource constraints require the rationing of services, as well as to programs seeking to extend their service offerings beyond their core campus constituencies (for example, to provide publishing services to society-sponsored journals not affiliated with the institution). In these situations, product and market management best practices—adapted to the library environment—provide a framework to guide libraries in evaluating, designing, and implementing fee-based services.

### ***Collaboration & Organization***

One of the most important results of the workshops was the networking and community building they stimulated. The workshop discussions covered library publishing collaborations with university presses and with other campus and extramural partners. Although only a small percentage of North American institutions have presses, library—press initiatives have been the most visible collaborations to-date. These partnerships are instructive as they combine the skills and missions of libraries and presses, while confronting the cultural, editorial, and economic differences between the two types of organizations.

The potential for collaboration between library publishing programs across institutions also attracted discussion. Such collaboration might entail the sharing of a single hosted publishing platform, pooled policy and process best practices, and cost sharing of outsourced publishing services, such as copyediting.

---

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

New and existing library publishing programs require guidance from specialized resources to ensure that they continue to grow and improve. To this end, a bibliography provided online at <http://wp.sparc.arl.org/lps>, provides key resources organized by the following subjects, and welcomes further suggestions:

- » Technological infrastructure;
- » Policies and processes;
- » Skills and training;
- » Business and sustainability models; and
- » Organization and collaboration.



## RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the needs identified by the survey and the case studies, and discussed during the workshops, the project has identified a set of broad recommendations, directed at the whole system as well as at individual publishing programs:

### ***Develop Best Practices for Library Publishing***

- » Develop meaningful impact metrics for library publishing services to demonstrate the effectiveness and value of library-based publishing programs and inform resource allocations.
- » Establish editorial quality and performance criteria to increase the value and longevity of the publications that library programs support.
- » Promote sustainability best practices to improve the long-term strength and stability of library publishing programs.
- » Develop return-on-investment justifications for funding library publishing programs to support increased library budget allocations in support of such programs.

### ***Collaborate to Create Community-based Resources***

- » Create a shared repository of policies, tools, and templates to improve and accelerate adherence to best practices and encourage community sharing and participation.
- » Develop centrally hosted software solutions for publishing platforms to facilitate cost sharing and support robust system functionality and capacity.
- » Share service models and revenue approaches to increase library publishing program funding options and facilitate the efficient implementation of successful programs.
- » Promote collaborations and partnerships to leverage resources within campuses, across institutions, and between university presses, scholarly societies, and other partners.

### ***Formalize Skills & Training***

- » Create formal and informal training venues to provide training and community-building resources, including virtual online conferences and seminars.
  
- » Articulate the particular value delivered by library publishing programs to define the role played by library publishing and position such programs with authors/editors, university administrators, funders, and others.
  
- » Establish dedicated library publishing positions to provide program champions and improve program continuity and success.



## INSTITUTIONS PARTICIPATING IN THE SURVEY BY TYPE

### *Association of Research Libraries*

University of Arizona  
Auburn University  
Boston College  
University of British Columbia  
University of Calgary  
University of California, Santa Barbara  
Canada Institute for Scientific and  
Technical Information (NRC-CISTI)  
Case Western Reserve University  
Center for Research Libraries  
University of Cincinnati  
University of Colorado at Boulder  
Colorado State University  
Columbia University  
University of Connecticut  
Cornell University  
Dartmouth College  
Duke University  
University of Florida  
Florida State University  
Georgetown University  
Georgia Institute of Technology  
University of Illinois at Chicago  
University of Illinois at  
Urbana-Champaign  
Indiana University  
Johns Hopkins University  
University of Kansas  
Kent State University  
University of Kentucky  
University of Louisville  
University of Maryland  
University of Massachusetts Amherst  
McGill University  
University of Miami  
University of Michigan  
Michigan State University  
University of Minnesota  
University of Missouri – Columbia  
National Agricultural Library  
National Library of Medicine  
University of Nebraska – Lincoln  
University of New Mexico  
New York University  
University of North Carolina at  
Chapel Hill  
North Carolina State University  
Northwestern University  
University of Notre Dame  
Ohio University  
The Ohio State University  
University of Ottawa  
Penn State University  
University of Pennsylvania  
University of Pittsburgh  
Princeton University  
Purdue University  
Queen’s University  
Rice University  
University of Rochester  
Rutgers University  
University of Saskatchewan  
University of Southern California  
Stony Brook University  
SUNY Buffalo  
Syracuse University  
Temple University  
Texas A&M University  
Texas Tech University  
University of Toronto  
University of Utah  
Vanderbilt University  
University of Washington  
Washington State University  
Washington University in St. Louis  
University of Wisconsin-Madison

## ***Oberlin Group***

Agnes Scott College  
Albion College  
Alma College  
Amherst College  
Atlanta University Center  
Augustana College  
Austin College  
Barnard College  
Bates College  
Beloit College  
Berea College  
Bowdoin College  
Bryn Mawr College  
Bucknell University  
Carleton College  
Coe College  
Colby College  
College of the Holy Cross  
Connecticut College  
DePauw University  
Dickinson College  
Earlham College  
Franklin & Marshall College  
Grinnell College  
Gustavus Adolphus College  
Hamilton College  
Haverford College

Kalamazoo College  
Kenyon College  
Knox College  
Lafayette College  
Lawrence University  
Macalester College  
Manhattan College  
Middlebury College  
Mills College  
Mount Holyoke College  
Oberlin College  
Occidental College  
Ohio Wesleyan University  
Randolph-Macon College  
Reed College  
Rhodes College  
Rollins College  
Skidmore College  
St. John's University  
St. Olaf College  
University of the South  
Trinity University  
Vassar College  
Wabash College  
Wesleyan University  
Wheaton College  
Whitman College

## ***University Libraries Group***

Baylor University  
Carnegie Mellon University  
University of Denver  
Northeastern University  
University of Richmond  
Saint Louis University

Southern Methodist University  
University of Tulsa  
Villanova University  
Wake Forest University  
Yeshiva University

---

## ***Affinity Group***

Ashland University  
Butler University  
Creighton University  
Fairfield University  
Ithaca College  
Loyola Marymount University  
Loyola University Maryland

Mercer University  
Providence College  
Roger Williams University  
Sacred Heart University  
Saint Joseph's University  
Valparaiso University

## **About this Publication**

This publication (Version 2.0, March 2012) is available for free (and for comment) at <http://wp.sparc.arl.org/lps>. The online version also contains appendices that present in more detail the results of the survey, reports from the workshops, case studies of sustainability strategies for publishing at the three institutions, and a guide to further reading. While the short account presented here suggest broad recommendations for “strategies for success” mainly at a system-wide level, library publishing practitioners will find more specific recommendations in the workshop report.

“Library Publishing Services: Strategies for Success” is published by SPARC on behalf of the libraries of Purdue University, Georgia Institute of Technology, and the University of Utah. This work is published under a Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-No Derivative Works 3.0 United States License. The author permits others to copy, distribute, display, and perform the work. In return, licensees must give the original author credit. In addition, the author permits others to copy, distribute, display and perform only unaltered copies of the work—not derivative works based on it. To view a copy of this license, see <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/us/>

The “Library Publishing Services: Strategies for Success” project was made possible by a Level II Collaborative Planning grant in the National Leadership Grant category from the U.S. Institute of Museum and Library Services (Award Log Number LG-65-10-0215-10). The Institute of Museum and Library Services (<http://www.imls.gov>) is the primary source of federal support for the nation’s 123,000 libraries and 17,500 museums. The Institute’s mission is to create strong libraries and museums that connect people to information and ideas. Any views, findings, conclusions, or recommendations expressed in this publication do not necessarily represent those of the Institute of Museum and Library Services.

Generous external support for this project was also received from: Berkeley Electronic Press, Microsoft Research, and SPARC, the *Scholarly Publishing and Academic Resources Coalition*





A free download of this publication is  
available from <http://wp.sparc.arl.org/lps>