

The Future of Open Access and Library Publishing

The Faculty of Oregon State University has made this article openly available.
Please share how this access benefits you. Your story matters.

Citation	Chadwell, F. A., & Sutton, S. C. (2014). The future of open access and library publishing. <i>New Library World</i> , 115(5/6), 225-236. doi:10.1108/NLW-05-2014-0049
DOI	10.1108/NLW-05-2014-0049
Publisher	Emerald Group Publishing Limited
Version	Accepted Manuscript
Terms of Use	http://cdss.library.oregonstate.edu/sa-termsfuse

This is a post-print of the article that appeared in New Library World. Citation: Chadwell, Faye and Sutton, Shan C. "The Future of Open Access and Library Publishing." New Library World 115, no. 5/6 (2014). To link to this article, use: 10.1108/NLW-05-2014-0049. This article is (c) Emerald Group Publishing and permission has been granted for this version to appear here: <http://ir.library.oregonstate.edu>. Emerald does not grant permission for this article to be further copied/distributed or hosted elsewhere without the express permission from Emerald Group Publishing Limited.

The Future of Open Access and Library Publishing

Faye A. Chadwell and Shan C. Sutton

Oregon State University Libraries and Press, Corvallis, Oregon, United States

Abstract

Purpose – The purpose of this article is to provide a vision for how academic libraries can assume a more central role in a future where Open Access publishing has become the predominant model for disseminating scholarly research articles.

Design/methodology/approach – The authors analyze existing trends related to Open Access policies and publishing with an emphasis on the development of repositories managed by libraries to publish and disseminate articles. We speculate that these trends, coupled with emerging economic realities, will create an environment where libraries' will assume a major role in the Open Access publishing environment. We provide some suggestions for how this major role might be funded.

Findings – The trends and economic realities we discuss will lead to new roles for academic librarians and will change existing roles.

Originality/value – This article provides insights for academic libraries and their institutions to consider a dramatic shift in the deployment of subscription dollars from a dysfunctional and largely closed scholarly communication system to one that provides open, unfettered access to research results.

Keywords -- academic libraries, library publishing services, Open Access, change, future

Paper type -- Viewpoint

Contact: Faye A. Chadwell, Donald and Delpha Campbell University Librarian and OSU Press Director; Oregon State University Libraries, 121 the Valley Library, Corvallis, OR 97331-4501; email: faye.chadwell@oregonstate.edu; phone: 541-737-7300; fax: 541-737-3453.

Shan C. Sutton, Associate University Librarian for Research and Scholarly Communication, Oregon State University Libraries, 121 the Valley Library, Corvallis, OR 97331-4501; email: shan.sutton@oregonstate.edu; phone: 541-737-8528, fax: 541-737-3453.

Brief biographical note:

Shan C. Sutton is Associate University Librarian for Research and Scholarly Communication at Oregon State University Libraries and Press. Before starting at OSU in June 2012, he was the Associate Dean and Head of Special Collections at the University of the Pacific Library in Stockton, California for eight years. His previous professional experience includes positions at the University of Arizona and the New Mexico State Archives. He holds a BS in Education and an MH in Humanities from Wright State University and an MA in Library Science from the University of Arizona.

Faye A. Chadwell was appointed the Donald and Delpha Campbell University Librarian and OSU Press Director at Oregon State University in May 2011. Prior to this appointment she was OSU's Associate University Librarian for Collections and Content Management, a position she'd held since August 2007. An Oregonian since 1995, she also served as the Head of Collection Development and Acquisitions at the University of Oregon Libraries. She worked at the University of South Carolina in Columbia as the social sciences bibliographer and as a reference librarian from 1988-1994. She holds a B.A. and an M. A. in English from Appalachian State University and an MLS from the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

The Future of Open Access and Library Publishing

INTRODUCTION

The future of academic libraries is open in more ways than one. As a profession, we like to say it's uncertain but on some level that is a copout. It fails to recognize that we can imagine a future for ourselves and then move actively toward that vision rather than having it handed to us on a not-so-silver platter. We also believe the future for academic libraries is open in terms of being catalysts for Open Access (OA) to the scholarship created by our institutions' faculty members. This vision for the future is predicated on our profession's track record of tremendous advocacy for opening up access to research outputs that are freely accessible online with full reuse rights. Our fundamental role in removing barriers to the free exchange of information is transforming the landscape of scholarly communication through building institutional repositories, publishing OA journals, hosting Open Educational Resources, facilitating access to research data, and advocating for the passage of OA policies. Many of these activities fall under the emerging field of library publishing, which will be a fundamental role for many academic libraries in an OA future.

This article looks into the future twenty years to postulate that as OA becomes the coin of the realm, libraries and librarians' primary roles will shift from buying information for their users to managing and disseminating the scholarship produced by their faculties, and other authors within disciplines that connect to their universities' areas of strength. This speculation clearly involves acts of conjecture by the authors, based on analysis of forces that are at work in today's world in combination with educated guesses and aspirations for how trends will evolve. The reality may ultimately pan out a little differently than we anticipate, but we are confident that in any case, the momentum of OA that is observable today will have major ramifications for the evolving roles of academic libraries and librarians in the future. As a result, we believe libraries will play a more vital role in the dissemination of scholarship than at any time in history. This envisioning is, we believe, an important way to lead ourselves into that open future to increase the positive impact of libraries on scholarly communication.

IMPACT OF OA POLICIES

Our vision for the future posits that academic libraries will claim a much more central role in OA publishing. This role will be buoyed by current and future trends in OA policies and publishing that play to the strengths of library publishing's focus

on OA dissemination accompanied by economic models that are not motivated by profit-making.

The current trend of OA policies being implemented by granting agencies and university faculties will accelerate over the next twenty years, and lead to near-universal adoption of requirements for immediate OA to scholarly articles and research data. An ever-increasing number of governmental granting agencies are already requiring OA or “public access” to the articles (and in some cases, data) produced by the research they sponsor. Examples include Research Councils UK and the Wellcome Trust in the United Kingdom, the National Institutes of Health, as well as most of the other major federal granting agencies in the United States by virtue of the White House Office of Science and Technology Planning’s 2013 OA directive. There is also legislation pending in the U.S. Congress, as well as the states of California and New York that would codify public access to research funded by those governments. These trends are not limited to North America and Europe, as evidenced in Argentina’s Congress passing a law in 2013 requiring OA to articles and data from federally funded research.

While granting agencies today are moving toward requiring OA to outputs of the research they fund, some tend to favor “gold” or “green” methods. Gold OA makes the content immediately accessible but unsubsidized journals often charge authors Article Processing Charges (APCs) paid out of grant funds. Green OA typically involves publication in subscription journals and deposits a version in an OA repository that is often subject to a publisher embargo that delays access to the open version. Between 2014 and 2034, we predict a progression in funder policies that leads to a standard requirement of immediate OA to the research outputs they fund to ensure the greatest impact for their investments. Some funders will supply the mechanisms through which dissemination occurs, such as original publication through a specific repository. Others will leave the selection of the OA publication method to the authors themselves. This development will leave library publishers well-positioned to provide immediate OA outlets, including repository-based platforms, that can be both academically rigorous (peer-reviewed) and economically attractive at little or no cost to the author.

A similar evolution will occur in faculty-established OA policies that will be in place at most universities by 2034. The model of faculty-driven, university-level OA policies is already in place at various institutions and the numbers are steadily growing across the globe, not just in North America and Europe. A 2014 study indicated that not only were most universities in Zimbabwe working toward institutional repositories to facilitate article deposit they also were working toward the implementation of OA policies. (Kusekwa & Mushowani, 2014). In the United States alone over fifty OA policies have been unanimously passed by faculty vote at the department, division, or university level as of May 2014 (“Unanimous Faculty Votes.”)

Many of these policies direct faculty to deposit final manuscripts of their published articles in their university's OA institutional repositories. In the near term, this policy model sets the default to "opt-in" for all faculty members, and enables universities to achieve higher success rates when requesting deposits of article manuscripts from faculty. In the long term, the policies facilitate faculty familiarity with their rights as authors, and can illustrate the benefits of OA through associated usage data such as article-level metrics. Although such policies allow for waivers to faculty members, and do not have coercive methods to ensure compliance, they have the potential to create greater faculty buy-in for OA and trust in library-managed repositories as dissemination vehicles for their research, potentially setting the stage for using repository-based systems as the primary method for publishing their scholarship in the future. As policies are passed by faculties in large systems such as the University of California, which established its policy in 2013 and covers over 8,000 authors, this awareness will continue to grow.

In 2034, OA policies or guidelines will also be common among scholarly societies. These organizations are increasingly embracing OA modes in conjunction with the publications they produce. Some societies such as the Modern Language Association maintain subscription-based journals, but have altered their author agreements to allow for the deposit of manuscripts into OA repositories. In terms of direct OA publishing, over 600 scholarly societies currently publish over 800 OA journals. Some of them charge APCs, while others do not. Stuart Shieber argues that scholarly societies are especially well positioned to benefit from shifts to OA in journal publishing, without making major economic sacrifices. (Shieber, 2013). These trends create positive conditions for partnerships to develop between societies and Library publishing programs that will offer immediate OA publishing services and infrastructure on attractive economic terms.

EVOLUTION OF OA PUBLISHING MODELS

The number of OA journals is constantly growing. According to the Directory of OA Journals, there was a fifteen percent increase in the number of titles from 2012-2013, with 3.5 new journals added to the Directory each day for a total of 9,804 at the end of 2013. (Morrison, 2014). All of the journals listed in the Directory of OA Journals make their content immediately, and freely available online upon publication, but their formats and underlying technical infrastructure varies widely. Some titles look and behave like traditional journals in PDF, while others function as repositories, or databases, of individual articles within a given discipline or range of disciplines. Examples of journals that behave much like repositories include *eLife* and Public Library of Science (PLoS) titles.

We predict that over the next twenty years, the repository model of publishing articles will become common in many disciplines, and enable library-supported repositories to shift from a focus on manuscripts of articles published in journals, to publishing original content through the repository itself. Such repositories will employ various forms of peer-review, including blind refereeing as well as those

based on reader comments and open peer review. This model is already employed in repositories such as the ArXiv pre-print server for papers in physics, mathematics, and related fields. Although most manuscripts currently deposited to ArXiv are eventually published in journals, some high-impact papers are only made available through ArXiv.

This model will become commonplace as article-level metrics of impact enter the mainstream, and scholars in other disciplines look to disseminate their work in open venues outside of journal structures. While journals have remain a prominent method through which research is distributed in the 21st century, there will be an increasing recognition by scholars, and faculty reward and recognition systems, that the quality and impact of one's scholarship is not solely dictated by the prestige of the journal title through which it is distributed. In many disciplines there will be a focus on article-level metrics as indicators of quality and impact that replace consideration of journal title's impact factor or reputation. This transition will position the article and its associated data as a unit of communicating knowledge and measuring impact that transcends the traditional journal structure. As part of this shift, academic libraries can readily design and refine repositories as OA publishing systems in conjunction with their faculty.

Whether a journal or repository structure is employed, we can expect to see new economic models emerge that enable immediate OA at low or not cost to the author. APC-based journals will face an altered landscape in which high APCs in the thousands of dollars will be limited to high profile titles in various disciplines that benefit from impact factors that attract those authors who remain focused on traditional, journal-level indicators of quality. Low APCs will have resulted from authors and research funders insisting over time that these charges be manageable across disciplines and not unduly divert funds from the research process. As a result, APCs will typically be in the hundreds of dollars, rather than the thousands of dollars charged by many current OA journals. This development will make OA options much more attractive to scholars in the Humanities, Social Sciences, and other areas that do not benefit from large external funding sources.

Subsidies for OA publishing that do not levy APCs are emerging in today's scholarly communication landscape, and will be commonplace in twenty years. One kind of collaborative support for APC-free, immediate OA will come from cooperatives in which scholars purchase low-cost memberships that include the right to publish and a commitment to take part in peer review in a journal instead of paying APCs. *PeerJ* is a current example of this model. It remains to be seen if this model is sustainable, but one can easily envision this kind of publishing cooperative being successfully implemented within a scholarly society in support of its publishing program.

Throughout the next 20 years, foundations, scholarly societies, and academic libraries will work together to support and subsidize OA article publishing in some disciplines. A current example of this approach by foundations is found in *eLife*, a journal with no APCs that is sponsored by the Howard Hughes Medical Insititute, the

Max Planck Society, and the Wellcome Trust. In the case of scholarly societies, membership dues will primarily underwrite OA article publishing. A current example of this strategy can be seen in *Cultural Anthropology*, which recently debuted non-APC, immediate OA version with technical support from Duke University Libraries. Another model along these lines that is currently in operation is SciELO, a cooperative platform funded by public institutions in fifteen Latin American countries that publishes over 750 OA scientific journals.

In addition to its value as an example of a discipline-based OA repository, ArXiv offers an extremely important economic model through its underlying partnership of sponsors. In early 2010, Cornell University Library (CUL) embarked on a three-year planning project to establish a long-term sustainable support model for arXiv based on voluntary institutional contributions and further supported by CUL and the Simmons Foundation. This membership plan was implemented in 2013 and included 173 members who represented 22 countries.

(<https://confluence.cornell.edu/display/culpublic/arXiv+Update>). The establishment of this plan was significant but Arxiv also played an important role in the gestation of another emerging economic model playing out currently through SCOAP3. The SCOAP3 model basically directs library subscription dollars for several key high energy physics journals to an OA model and the participating publishers in response reduce subscriptions for participating libraries. We predict that models like SCOAP3 will have broad appeal as a way for libraries to gain a level of comfort in redirecting subscription funds toward OA models.

Initially with models like SCOAP, libraries will feel safe to just continue to direct their subscription dollars to publishers in order to make content immediately accessible to all readers. Over time, authors and readers will discover the publishing platforms of library repositories, considering them as viable as the publisher platforms. This viability reflects deeper partnerships and development opportunities among libraries, foundations, institutions, funding agencies, and scholarly societies that share costs and expertise in building platforms to include requisite usage statistics, alt-metrics, and appropriate reviewing mechanisms.

LIBRARY PUBLISHING DIRECTIONS

As academic libraries continue to seek ways to support OA endeavors such as ArXiv and SCOAP3, many are also building robust library publishing services as they seek to become disseminators of scholarly communication in ways that transcend the traditional roles of acquiring information for users that is produced by publishers.

The role of academic libraries as publishers is already firmly in place at many institutions. One indication of the maturity of library publishing as a field is the recent establishment of the Library Publishing Coalition (LPC). This organization is currently made up of sixty academic libraries involved in a broad range of publishing activities under this definition:

The LPC defines library publishing as 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 OA dissemination and a willingness to embrace informal and experimental forms of scholarly communication and to challenge the status quo. (See Library Publishing Directory, 2014)

In 2014 the Library Publishing Coalition hosted a two-day conference, and published the first *Library Publishing Directory*, a print and online resource that describes programs at 115 libraries. The *Directory* provides a valuable snapshot of the scope of library publishing, which involves both peer reviewed and non-peer reviewed content. For example, in 2013 the libraries listed in the directory published over 500 journals, 900 monographs, 8,700 conference papers and proceedings, 100,000 electronic theses and dissertations, and 100,000 technical reports. These publications span disciplines, and have a strong tendency to be electronic and OA. In some cases, the library is responsible for all aspects of production, including management of editorial and peer review, while in others the library functions as a hosting service. The momentum created by these library-based programs will undoubtedly grow as the organizations collaborate on publishing ventures that cross-institutional boundaries, and more libraries enter the publishing field in partnership with their institutions' faculty authors and editors.

The expansion of library publishing programs had been supported early on by the ongoing development of institutional repositories and open source publishing systems (i.e., Open Journal System) as well as commercial systems (i.e., Digital Commons). Academic libraries have invested in the development of institutional repositories throughout the world since the 1990s. While early institutional repositories began appearing in the US and Europe in 1995, academic libraries in China and Turkey began implementing them in the early 2000s and in Middle Eastern countries began exploring the possibilities in the 2010s. (Ahmed & Al-Baridi, 2012; Cimen, 2012; and Hu, Luo, & Liu 2013). The Confederation of Open Access Repositories has brought together repositories on a global scale to facilitate interoperability and creation of a global network. These systems have the potential to expose a vulnerability of commercial publishers to a DIY environment where libraries and institutions with access to adequate technology, peer reviewing and editing expertise, and growing savvy about publishing can create publishing platforms that take back some control of their intellectual capital on favorable economic terms.

Although many of today's institutional repositories are based on hosting manuscripts of articles that are published in subscription journals, in 2034 repositories will also focus on making original articles and related data accessible. In this process, the boundaries in the current dialectic of Green and Gold OA will become blurred. Researchers will be motivated to publish their content through repositories as their perspectives become more article/data-centric, and less compelled by publication in specific journals. Another advantage that library publishers will have over commercial publishers is a willingness to "publish" the complete oeuvre of a scholar across her or his career at an institution—data, white papers, technical reports, presentations, etc. This allows a scholar and her/his institution to more easily track the full impact of research but it also positions libraries to fully document the work of influential scholars.

ECONOMIC REALITIES AND OPPORTUNITIES

The previously discussed trends and developments will prepare the way for libraries to assume a central role in the establishment of OA modes of dissemination. These modes can enable scholars to fully realize the objectives of immediate, unfettered access to research outputs at low or no cost to the author. As stated earlier, a synergy will result based on an increasing recognition that the current model is no longer the sole model. The technologies, resources, and skills required to vet and distribute scholarship are not the sole province of the publishing industry. Instead, the academy can employ them to bring about a more open exchange of knowledge in scholarly communication on better economic terms. For example, if one reviews the blog post "73 Things Publishers Do (2013 Edition)," the scope of activity is impressive, and it concludes with the statement, "In the big picture, having publishers doing these things means that scientists and policymakers don't have to do them and can focus on doing their work. We represent a set of trades and associated professionals who do all these things on their behalf." (Anderson, 2013). The future we envision adds "academic libraries and their partners" to the equation of who may act in these roles. A major catalyst that finally motivates scholars, librarians and higher education administrators to realize the need for university-based publishing models has to do with facing economic realities. Several factors will influence the choices libraries (and their institutions) make to deploy their materials budgets to subsidize OA publishing managed by academic libraries.

One economic reality that will play a part in the fate of the subscription model, we conjecture, has to do with evidence librarians amass as a result of article level usage statistics. Journal content in the digital world is discovered and consumed at the article level through search engines, discovery tools, RSS feeds, and tools like Browzine. Since the advent of electronic journal subscriptions, download statistics have been a somewhat useful gauge of journal significance for a campus but with obvious limitations. Are downloads from current or past issues? From a select number of articles or mostly just a single article? Libraries addressed this issue by

moving some titles to a pay per view system. Again there are potential issues with such models. A library could theoretically be purchasing the same article over and over again. We predict that with the data that librarians gather from Pirus (a tool for recording article-level usage of across a variety of online journals, databases, repositories, and aggregators), or its future manifestation, librarians will be able to demonstrate what we have suspected all along-- a low percentage of articles for a given journal (i.e., 20 percent) generates the highest percentage (i.e., 80 percent) of the overall journal usage. (<http://www.projectcounter.org/pirus.html>) These developments in collection use assessment will continue to foster an article-centric mentality that can extend to the publication processes used by libraries as well.

A more significant economic reality is born out of long-term dissatisfaction with the business models that many commercial academic journal publishers have deployed since the 1908s. While publishers do add considerable value beyond packaging the content and managing the review and editing of it, the price in most cases appears to be well beyond the cost of value added by the publisher, a reality that is clearly illustrated in the industry's annual profit reports. As consumers of published information, libraries have endured years of rising serials costs throughout the latter part of the 20th century. The rise in serials expenditures among ARL libraries continued mostly unabated as reports in the early 2000s showed increases of 385 percent between 1986 and 2009.

(http://www.academia.edu/1615991/The_Challenge_of_Scholarly_Communication_in_the_21st_Century). If the expected 2014 serials increase averaged at 6.5 percent were to remain steady for the next 20 years with no changes to the model, the academy would see an estimated increase of 250 percent between 2014 and 2034. <http://lj.libraryjournal.com/2013/04/publishing/the-winds-of-change-periodicals-price-survey-2013/#>

We do not expect libraries to see 6.5 percent annual increases to our budgets in the next 20 years that could offset such increases in subscription costs. Instead we expect libraries and their home institutions to be subject to unhealthy and fluctuating financial states that will have significant impact our ability to continue our current purchasing rates. A 2013 report published by the State Higher Education Finance had reported that "Despite the increase in educational appropriations in 2013 and continued increases in net tuition revenues, total revenue per FTE remains 6.2% below the 2008 pre-recession level"

(http://www.sheeo.org/sites/default/files/publications/SHEF_FY13_%20Press%20Release_FINAL_041514.pdf). It's not hard to imagine this ongoing decline in state support for funding higher education expanding into the next several decades. A predicted continuing instability in federal investment in the university research enterprise will only exacerbate the situation.

Given the ongoing issue with the current serials pricing model, coupled with aforementioned funding challenges for higher education and the research enterprise, at some point it will become clear to libraries (and their home institutions) that a new model is needed. The academy cannot sustain two parallel

systems—one for buying subscriptions and the other for funding or supporting OA systems and platforms. While the declining number of subscription-based journals will decline precipitously over the next twenty years, we predict that given tight budget scenarios, some libraries and their universities will act in coordination with their faculties and each other or other partners to boldly redirect large portions of their acquisition dollars toward support for OA dissemination and publishing activities rather than continuing to support the legacy system. Based on part on evidence from the SciLEO consortium, Bjorn Brembs calls for this model: “I propose that a small set of competent and motivated libraries with large subscription budgets and substantial faculty support cooperate in taking the lead. This group of libraries would shift funds from subscriptions to investing in developing infrastructure and other components for a library-based scholarly communication system. He estimates that this could deliver savings of somewhere between 30-90% over today’s subscription costs.” (Poynder, 2013).

These bold experiments will build on the maturing library publishing models documented across the Library Publishing Coalition, as well as repository-based publishing that could be demonstrated by projects like ArXiv. The natural proximity that academic librarians have to their faculty counterparts in colleges and departments across their campuses will foster more of these partnerships, especially with scholarly societies. These joint publishing ventures will pool resources to offer a different business model for publishing, often focusing on broad disciplinary topics such as natural resources, agriculture, or social justice, where groups of institutions had already long-established research collaborations. In this instance, the libraries or universities in a consortium will opt to direct subscription dollars for a set of journals in a specific field. Consortial members will co-develop and co-maintain publishing platforms to publish the articles with immediate OA at low or no cost to authors. Commercial publishers are not a part of this equation though there is an opportunity to integrate the existing expertise of university presses into this model. This development would naturally build on the current trend of university presses merging with academic libraries.

NEW PUBLISHING ROLE EQUALS NEW ROLES IN LIBRARIES

This move to large-scale OA models of library publishing will involve new roles and positions for librarians that replace duties previously based on the acquisition of content from publishers. The beginnings of the shift can already be seen at libraries with substantial publishing programs, and through new conceptualizations of liaison duties. A report by Janice Jaguszewski and Karen Williams in the ARL-published series *New Roles for New Times* observes, “A liaison who understands how scholars in a particular discipline communicate and share information with one another can inform the design and development of new publishing services, such as digital institutional repositories.” (Jaguszewski and Williams, 2013, p. 4). Because libraries will be coordinating dissemination and publishing activities for their home institutions, library faculty will assume roles such as digital publishing librarian, alt-metrics expert, publishing systems coordinator, data management and

access coordinator, data visualization librarian, and digital humanities coordinator. The Lib Pub blogs provides a good overview of the responsibilities that a digital publishing librarian might assume (“Preparing Librarians. . . , 2013).

It will also be commonplace for scholars to make their research data, especially data associated with articles, openly available through institutional and discipline-based data repositories. In 2034, we expect that every major research library will have 3-5 data management and access specialists. These positions will also be important because extensive data preservation and curation infrastructures will need to be in place that reflect academia’s commitment to the reuse and repurposing of research data as an integral part of scholarly communication that includes publishing and disseminating research articles.

Fewer staff, rather than librarians, will be needed to manage legacy print collections because a significant amount of such collections will be housed in regional and statewide archives. These staff positions over time can be redeployed to support OA operations and publishing. Staffing in what was traditional technical services also will be leaner or redirected toward work focused on managing institutional repositories and the publishing services offered by libraries. They will focus on ingesting, organizing, creating, and managing data related to the intellectual output deposited in library repositories in order for that output to be discovered and shared through an ecosystem of repositories and digital asset management systems. As early as 2009, library literature was documenting the changes to workflows to accommodate how libraries would manage information deposited in institutional repositories. In 2013, Madsen and Oleen mention how scaling up the operations of the Kansas State University institutional repository to expand “the number of faculty participants and content, was addressed as part of a library-wide reorganization that provided more staff working as a cross-departmental team. This staff expansion, in turn, created the need to redefine staff responsibilities, develop resources to manage workflows, and provide greater efficiencies” (Madsen and Oleen, 2013, p. 2).

Because library budgets have been directed to support the OA infrastructure, those librarians and staff once engaged in managing subscriptions and other acquisitions will manage the economic transactions associated with new OA publishing models and cooperatives. Publishers like Taylor and Francis have admitted that a major stressor in managing OA is managing the author fees or APCs. “In the subscription world, about 85% of transactions are administered by subscription agents, or mediated through institutional, consortial or national sales deals. OA is driving an increase in the number of complex micro-payments, usually between the publisher and a funder or institution, but increasingly between publishers and individuals” (Gardner, 33). The library could manage the payment of such transactions in a library publishing system just as librarians have historically managed payments for content at a micro level—pay per view, patron-driven acquisitions, and so on. Assessment of the new economic models and usage of the content it supports will also be pivotal in providing evidence of the impact of the funding shifts and the

impact of the scholarship itself.

“There has always been a readiness within the library to recognize that certain functions require specialized education or training for which the MLS is not adequate preparation” (1994 ARL SPEC Kit). A dominant OA model will certainly require that libraries hire non-librarian professionals at least until more library school programs have evolved to provide adequate training. Data management specialists immediately come to mind. As Martin Lewis states, “It is likely or even probable that data scientists will not come from traditional library backgrounds; they are more likely to be career researchers for whom a period as a data scientist is part of a longer-term research career track” (Lewis, 2010, p. 22). Libraries engaging in robust publishing services will also need to hire those individuals who have expertise in acquiring content, managing peer review processes, and providing editing, design and production expertise for digital publications. This is an important skill set that is currently missing from the library publishing scene and not emphasized in library schools. The phenomenon of university presses reporting to university libraries could partially address this dearth for some organizations. Purdue University Libraries represents one existing model of how this could work but libraries without this organizational alignment will not have this benefit.

CONCLUSION

In this article, we have endeavored to construct an open future for libraries by analyzing trends and making conjectures based on that analysis. Whether our predictions prove completely accurate or not, we can confidently make two central conclusions: OA and library publishing share an intertwined future, and that future promises to be one of the most intriguing aspects in the evolution of academic libraries over the next twenty years. While it sometimes seems as if academic libraries are at the mercy of technological and economic forces beyond our control, we are well positioned to guide our future roles in scholarly communication. By shifting our *modus operandi* from being consumers of information to becoming disseminators of scholarship, we can skillfully navigate the changing landscape in which OA will become the default method for distributing the outputs of research. In the process, we will provide our faculty and other scholars with publishing services that fully support OA in ways that are economically feasible for the academy. Building the personnel skill sets and economic and technological infrastructure of this service model are only one part of the equation. We must also continue to act as advocates for scholars to embrace new open modes of scholarship that challenge the traditional practices that unduly limit the accessibility of information, but are firmly entrenched in many disciplines.

From our perspective, the role of OA publisher recasts the academic library’s long-standing mission to facilitate research and remove barriers to information. Many of the changes we predict are already taking root at libraries around the world. One of the absolute keys to realizing our potential impact in OA publishing is influence emerging trends. The other key is to avoid operating in isolation from each other.

By collaborating across institutions, libraries and scholars can collectively build new open models of scholarly communication by 2034 that will fully transcend the limitations of today's publication systems.

REFERENCES

Ahmed, S. & Al-Baridi, S. (2012), "An overview of institutional repository developments in the Arabian Gulf Region", *OCLC Systems & Services*, 28, 2, pp. 79-89, Library, Information Science & Technology Abstracts, EBSCOhost, viewed 30 April 2014.

Anderson, K. (2013), "73 Publishers Do (2013 Edition)," available at: <http://scholarlykitchen.sspnet.org/2013/10/22/updated-73-things-publishers-do-2013-edition/>, viewed 2 May 2014.

Cimen, E. (2012), "Future of resource sharing in Turkey: can OA be an alternative?" *Interlending & Document Supply*, 40, 3, pp. 144-149, Library, Information Science & Technology Abstracts, EBSCOhost, viewed 1 May 2014.

Hu, D., Luo, A., & Liu, H. (2013), "OA in China and its Effect on Academic Libraries," *Journal Of Academic Librarianship*, 39, 1, pp. 110-112, Library, Information Science & Technology Abstracts, EBSCOhost, viewed 30 April 2014.

Jaguszewski, J. and Williams, K. (2013), *Transforming Liaison Roles in Research Libraries*. Association for Research Libraries. <http://www.arl.org/storage/documents/publications/NRNT-Liaison-Roles-final.pdf>, viewed 3 May 2014.

Kusekwa, L. & Mushowani, A. (2014), 'The OA landscape in Zimbabwe: the case of university libraries in ZULC', *Library Hi Tech*, 32, 1, pp. 69-82, Library, Information Science & Technology Abstracts, EBSCOhost, viewed 30 April 2014.

Lewis, M. (2010), Preprint of "Libraries and the Management of Research Data" in McKnight, S. (Ed.), *Envisioning Future Academic Library Services Initiatives, Ideas and Challenges*, Facet Publishing, London, pp. 1-28. http://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/11171/1/LEWIS_Chapter_v10.pdf, viewed May 2, 2014.

"Preparing Librarians for Another New Role: Digital Publisher." (2013), Lib Pub Blog. <http://librarypublishing.wordpress.com/2013/07/02/preparing-librarians-for-another-new-role-digital-publisher/>, viewed 2 May 2014.

Library Publishing Directory, 2014. Edited by Sarah K. Lippincott. Library Publishing Coalition, 2014.

Madsen, D. and Oleen, J.K. (2013), "Staffing and Workflow of a Maturing Institutional Repository." *Journal of Librarianship and Scholarly Communication*, 1(3):eP1063. <http://dx.doi.org/10.7710/2162-3309.1063>, viewed 30 April 2014.

Morrison, H. (2014), "Dramatic Growth of Open Access: December 31, 2013: first open source edition", available at: <http://poeticeconomics.blogspot.ca/2014/01/dramatic-growth-of-open-access-december.html>, viewed 2 May 2014.

"Unanimous Faculty Votes." [no date]. In Open Access Directory, available at: http://oad.simmons.edu/oadwiki/Unanimous_faculty_votes, viewed 2 May 2014.

Poynder, R. (2013), "Björn Brembs on the state of Open Access: Where are we, what still needs to be done?", available at: <http://poynder.blogspot.co.uk/2013/09/bjorn-brembs-on-state-of-open-access.html>, viewed 1 May 2014.

Shieber, S. (2013), "Why Open Access is Better for Scholarly Societies," available at: <https://blogs.law.harvard.edu/pamphlet/2013/01/29/why-open-access-is-better-for-scholarly-societies/>, viewed 2 May 2014.