Effective Practices and Strategies for Open Access Outreach: A Qualitative Study

Diane (DeDe) Dawson

Effective Practices and Strategies for Open Access Outreach: A Qualitative Study

Diane (DeDe) Dawson

Science & Scholarly Communication Librarian, University of Saskatchewan

INTRODUCTION There are many compelling reasons to make research open access (OA), but raising the awareness of faculty and administrators about OA is a struggle. Now that more and more funders are introducing OA policies, it is increasingly important that researchers understand OA and how to comply with these policies. U.K. researchers and their institutions have operated within a complex OA policy environment for many years, and academic libraries have been at the forefront of providing services and outreach to support them. This article discusses the results of a qualitative study that investigated effective practices and strategies of OA outreach in the United Kingdom. **METHODS** Semistructured interviews were conducted with 14 individuals at seven universities in the United Kingdom in late 2015. Transcripts of these interviews were analyzed for dominant themes using an inductive method of coding. **RESULTS** Themes were collected under the major headings of "The Message"; "Key Contacts and Relationships"; "Qualities of the OA Practitioner"; and "Advocacy versus Compliance." **DISCUSSION** Results indicate that messages about OA need to be clear, concise, and jargon free. They need to be delivered repeatedly and creatively adapted to specific audiences. Identifying and building relationships with influencers and informers is key to the uptake of the message, and OA practitioners must have deep expertise to be credible as the messengers. **CONCLUSION** This timely research has immediate relevance to North American libraries as they contend with pressures to ramp up their own OA outreach and support services to assist researchers in complying with new federal funding policies.

Correspondence: Diane Dawson, Room 180, Geology Building, Science Library, University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon, SK S7N 5E2, diane.dawson@usask.ca

IMPLICATIONS FOR PRACTICE

1. This paper outlines effective strategies and practices of library outreach to researchers on open access (OA). Librarians may consider these as recommendations to follow when planning scholarly communication outreach in general, or they could also be adapted for awareness-raising initiatives on other topics.

2. Funder OA policies are motivating researchers to act, but there is a danger that they will begin to see OA as just another administrative burden on their time. Librarians need to consider how best to balance their messaging between advocacy and compliance to ensure that researchers also appreciate the many benefits of OA.

3. Librarians often struggle to communicate with researchers. This study raises some intriguing possible explanations as to why some faculty might be unreceptive to OA outreach from librarians. These ideas require further study.

INTRODUCTION

"The pathway to open access requires considerable education and outreach in order to engage faculty and shift academic publishing traditions and practice" (Goger, 2015, p. 19). Anecdotally, scholarly communication (SC) librarians and other open access practitioners[1] report that they struggle to even get the word out about OA, let alone get researchers to adopt OA publishing behaviors. There are many compelling reasons for faculty to make their research OA, and there are many resources to assist them, but raising their awareness is a perpetual challenge.

Misunderstanding and lack of familiarity are perhaps the biggest obstacles to OA (Suber, 2012). Over the years, studies that survey researchers' attitudes toward OA have found persistent myths and misinformation—as well as a lack of understanding about copyright, author's rights, and resources—to support them in making their research products open (see Dawson, 2014; Hahn, 2008; McDonald, Gibson, Yates, & Stephenson, 2016; Morris & Thorn, 2009; Xia, 2010; Yang & Li, 2015). Researchers need support in this area. Overwhelmingly academic libraries are leading the efforts to raise OA awareness at their institutions and have implemented SC services to familiarize researchers with both green- and gold-route OA services.[2] Such services include institutional repositories (IRs) and facilitated

---

[1] I use OA practitioners as a broad term to encompass both SC librarians and other (nonlibrarian) library employees who also conduct OA outreach.

[2] Green route means that the manuscript is deposited in an open online repository; gold route means that it is published in an open access journal.

deposit to encourage green OA, author's funds to pay for gold OA article-processing charges (APCs), and educational programs (Radom, Feltner-Reichert, & stringer-stanback, 2012). All of these support services require outreach to researchers.

The research question this study sets out to answer is: What are the most effective practices and strategies for OA outreach? Much of what we consider good practice is anecdotal. This research project's aim was to interview experts who are experienced and knowledgeable in OA outreach at their institutions in order to provide evidence-based guidance to assist SC librarians, and other OA practitioners, in raising researchers' awareness about OA, their funders' policies, and the services available to support them in making their research products OA.

BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

Research funders are increasingly implementing policies requiring researchers to provide OA to the results of their funded research. In May 2015, the three major federal funders[3] of academic research in Canada implemented a joint *Tri-Agency Open Access Policy on Publications* (Government of Canada, 2016). The policy mandates that all peer-reviewed articles resulting from Tri-Agency funding be made OA within 12 months of publication through either the green or gold route. Academic librarians across the country began building up their SC services in anticipation of the increased demand. It was in this context that the present study was conceived.

The United Kingdom is the geographic focus of this research. Canadian librarians have much to learn from their U.K. counterparts. U.K. researchers and their institutions have faced an increasingly complex OA policy environment for several years now. The Research Councils UK (RCUK), analogous to the Tri-Agency in Canada, is the main federal funder of academic research, and its *RCUK Policy on Open Access* was implemented in 2013 (RCUK, 2013) in response to the much-discussed "Finch Report" (Finch, 2012). The Wellcome Trust, a large nongovernmental charitable foundation that supports biomedical research, implemented an *Open Access Policy* in 2013 as well—followed by several other health research charities that now form a *Charity Open Access Fund* partnership (Wellcome Trust, 2013; Wellcome Trust, 2014). Additionally, the Higher Education Funding Council of England (HEFCE), the public body that determines the distribution of funding to academic institutions in

---

[3] The three funding agencies are the Canadian Institutes of Health Research (CIHR), the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada (NSERC), and the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada (SSHRC).

England, has recently introduced an OA requirement to their post-2014 Research Excellence Framework (REF) exercise (HEFCE, 2015).

These mandates have different compliance requirements making for a complex policy environment, and academic libraries have been on the forefront of providing OA support to help researchers comply with these policies (see Fruin, 2017). U.K. librarians and OA practitioners have been operating under these conditions for several years. Enough time has now passed to reflect on their OA outreach support programs' performance and attempt to determine effective practices and strategies across multiple institutions.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Defining Outreach

Outreach has many definitions (see Ford, 2009; McDevitt, 2013), but most academic librarians define *outreach* as reaching out to those in their campus community to raise awareness about library services and resources (Courtney, 2009). In this article, I use the term *outreach* to encompass a broad range of engagement and communication activities, from marketing and promotion to awareness-raising and advocacy—with the specific intent of providing information about OA to members of the campus community, particularly faculty or other researchers. This definition also aligns well with Otto's (2016) definition of *outreach*:

> In this paper, the terms *Outreach* and *Outreach programs* refer to libraries' systematic, often comprehensive, efforts to provide information on open access to the university community, and particularly to faculty and other scholars, in hopes of increasing engagement with open access and/or contributions to the institutional repository. (p. 5)

Outreach to Researchers on Open Access and Scholarly Communication

Academic librarians have led the way in establishing SC outreach programs to raise researchers' awareness about OA and other topics (Hahn, 2008). As early as 2007, 75% of Association of Research Libraries (ARL) libraries surveyed indicated that they were engaged in SC educational activities, and the rest were in the planning stages of such programs (Newman, Blecic, & Armstrong, 2007). More recently, a NASIG (2017) task force developed a list of *Core Competencies for Scholarly Communication Librarians*. They identify outreach and instruction as one of the four themes common to all SC librarians: "The SCL [SC librarian] is actively engaged with a rapidly-changing landscape that necessitates clear communication, advocacy, and outreach involving many different internal and external audiences" (NASIG, 2017, p. 3).

Corbett (2009) stresses that outreach on SC needs to be a two-way street, more conversation than education: "Faculty may resent a scholarly communication program that seems to be 'educating' them about a process with which they are intimately familiar" (p. 130). This is delicate territory. Many researchers may not be aware that they need further education about SC issues, and even if they are aware, they may not view librarians as qualified to help them. White (2002) examined why faculty don't participate in information literacy programs developed for them, and some of her thoughts may resonate with SC librarians' experiences:

> There appears to be an aversion to being taught by one's own colleagues, and particularly those conceived of as being less adequate than the intended learner— since in many instances, librarians do not have, nor are they required to possess, doctoral degrees. Another theory is that faculty members are hesitant to reveal that they lack current skills and knowledge in this aspect of the academic research process. Perhaps some feel that they are being placed in the position of students, and thus experience a sense of loss of power and control. (p. 325)

Establishing good working relationships with faculty might be key to navigating these potentially touchy situations. Others have also shown that the faculty-librarian relationship improves the uptake of library services (Eva, 2015; Kotter, 1999).

Relationships and outreach are inseparable. Vandegrift and Colvin (2012) attribute the relationships they developed to their success in increasing awareness of SC and OA issues on the Florida State University campus in a relatively short time period. They identify several key steps in the development of their SC outreach program: involving faculty in the process, reaching out to key administrators, and identifying potential partnerships (Vandegrift & Colvin, 2012). Involving faculty ensures that initiatives are not seen as being solely library driven or administration driven, and reaching out to key administrators is politically important. Because they found maintaining a consistent, clear, and simple message essential, they also developed a "cheat-sheet" of concise points on OA that their task force members could consult for quick answers.

Compelling and carefully crafted communications are necessary. As Otto (2016) states, "many have called for more and better outreach programs, and the time is ripe for a more in-depth look at effective faculty outreach messages" (p. 4). She describes a specific, targeted message developed at Rutgers University to increase faculty understanding of OA and compliance with a new campus OA policy. The message was continually honed and perfected over multiple presentations to faculty until audience responses were consistently positive. In her analysis of the message, Otto (2016) and her colleague found 18 key points

that, combined with the presenters' neutral stance and positive tone, made it effective. She stresses that messages about what OA means need to be clear and "speak to scholars' highest hopes and to the promise and inevitability of open access, aligning its core principles with faculty values such as leadership, innovation, creativity, intellectual progress, and legacy" (Otto, 2016, p. 29).

For many SC librarians, OA may seem such an obvious public good that it is difficult to understand why others even need convincing. Cirasella's (2017) reflective essay on her experiences in OA outreach is entertaining and enlightening. Her key insight is that outreach needs to be modified for different audiences. This includes not just the arguments used in the messages, but also the tone they are delivered in. Anger at the inequities and unsustainability of the current scholarly publishing system may be motivating for the SC librarian, but such anger may repel the listeners (Cirasella, 2017).

Often, the best means of delivering a message may not be directly from the library at all. Word-of-mouth marketing can be a very effective outreach technique in academic libraries because the message is delivered to the intended audience by one of their peers, instead of by the library itself (Alire, 2007). "It is said that 10% of people influence the other 90%, so it's important to cultivate a library 'champion' who falls within that vital 10% to spread the word" (Potter, 2012, p. 140). Goger (2015) describes a successful word-of-mouth OA outreach initiative at the University of California (UC), Merced. Because there was a rigorous debate about the new UC Open Access Policy, the librarians decided that faculty voices would be stronger than librarian voices in convincing faculty of the policy's merits (Goger, 2015). They recruited faculty who had reported positive experiences making their research OA and interviewed them on video. The videos were professionally produced and edited, then distributed on campus to raise awareness and support for the policy. Goger (2015) emphasizes that to be effective, this kind of outreach must be authentic, not scripted. Engagement and two-way conversation is the goal.

In response to the growing complexity of the OA policy environment in the United Kingdom, and the importance being placed on compliance, Jisc (an organization that supports higher education institutions in the United Kingdom) coordinated a community-based project to share OA good practice (see Jisc, 2016). Through this activity, 30 universities developed pathfinder projects in several areas of focus to help institutions implement OA over two years. Although the project is now complete, an impressive collection of materials remains available on the website to support SC librarians and OA practitioners. A handbook (Blanchett & DeGroff, 2016) summarizes the lessons learned from this initiative and includes a section on advocacy. Blanchett and DeGroff (2016) state that "the importance of raising awareness and understanding of open access was a strong theme across nearly all of

the projects" (p. 15). They highlight the various tools developed during this activity including methods to build researchers' knowledge and engage them in OA (e.g., intervention mapping and needs analyses), and strategies for simplifying messages. The OA Advocacy Toolkit is particularly salient; it outlines seven practical steps and recommendations for OA outreach (Jisc, Newcastle University, the University of Nottingham, & University College London, 2015).

Other academic library literature on OA or SC outreach includes practice articles describing specific initiatives such as a series of invited expert speakers (Wright, 2013); the development of a Faculty Learning Community on SC (Bazeley, Waller, & Resnis, 2014); the formation of a Copyright Committee to develop outreach programs (Duncan, Clement, & Rozum, 2013); and of course, Open Access Week initiatives (e.g. Johnson, 2014; Lawton, 2016; Wirth, 2011). Extensive literature on IRs discusses outreach to researchers to recruit content (e.g. Gierveld, 2006; Giesecke, 2011; Madsen & Oleen, 2013; Mercer, Rosenblum, & Emmett, 2007; Nabe, 2010; Troll Covey, 2011). However, focusing outreach on content recruitment for the IR misses an important opportunity to promote OA in general; the IR is simply one tool (Otto, 2016).

Indeed, most of the literature on OA or SC outreach describes specific initiatives and discusses why they were (or were not) successful. Useful advice can be gleaned from many of them. The present study attempts to answer the question more directly by bringing together qualitative evidence from interviews with experts in the provision of OA outreach. This approach complements and builds upon the literature cited above. Semistructured interviews, of the type I conducted for this study, have the potential to deeply explore a topic by enabling the interviewer to pursue themes or ideas as they emerge in conversation.

METHODS

Participant Selection

It was not logistically possible to interview all potential participants, so I selected libraries through purposive sampling. This sampling method identifies participants who are predicted to be experienced and knowledgeable in the subject under investigation (Wildemuth & Cao, 2009). I limited my sample to participants from large, research-intensive institutions who were most likely to have had substantial experience with OA outreach and support. To meet these criteria, I chose libraries from institutions that are members of the Russell

Group[4] and are within the top 20 of RCUK OA grant-size ranking (see RCUK, 2015, p. 34). Additionally, I relied on suggestions from several higher education and library professionals in the United Kingdom, such as representatives from the Research Libraries U.K. (RLUK) and Jisc. Based on these measures, I selected seven institutions in Scotland and England to include in my sample.

I identified appropriate individuals at each institution by referral from the representatives noted above and through library website directory listings. I sent personalized email invitations to these individuals in September and October, 2015. These letters of initial contact summarized the research study and its potential benefits for the participants and the entire higher education community. The interviews took place in person in November and December, 2015.

Data Collection

I conducted semistructured interviews with one to three individuals at each selected institution. In total, I interviewed 14 individuals who were responsible for the SC outreach programs at their institutions. Some of these individuals were librarians and some were not; therefore, I use the term *OA practitioners* interchangeably with *SC librarians* in this paper. All but one of the participants were library employees and based in the library. OA outreach is almost exclusively a library role in the United Kingdom. I did not keep demographic information on the participants. The goal of this research was not to study the participants themselves or the institutions, but to focus on the OA outreach services they provide.

I followed an interview guide with five sections (see Appendix). I adapted the questions' wording and order to suit the direction of the interview, making sure to cover certain topics but eliminating others if time did not permit. This semistructured interview format allows for the flexibility to pursue unanticipated new topics as they emerge and makes for a more natural conversation. Each interview was conducted for approximately 45–60 minutes, digitally recorded, then transcribed upon my return to Canada.

Data Analysis

I coded the transcripts in the qualitative software package NVivo. Because this was an exploratory study, I did not know what I would find, so I used an inductive method of analysis as described by Braun and Clarke (2006). As I read the transcripts, themes emerged directly

[4] The Russell Group comprises 24 research-intensive, public universities in the United Kingdom; it is roughly analogous to the U15 Group in Canada.

from the data. After several read-throughs of all transcripts, I collected the numerous codes into categories and grouped the categories into four key themes.

RESULTS

Numerous recurrent strategies and practices for OA outreach emerged. I identified four key themes through the qualitative analysis: The Message; Key Contacts and Relationships; Qualities of the OA Practitioner; and Advocacy versus Compliance. Each theme has some overlap with others.

Theme 1: The Message

The main objective of this research project was to explore effective outreach strategies, and this was also the stated topic of the interviews. So, it is unsurprising that the bulk of the findings relate to communications and practical strategies for delivering particular messages.

Keep it Simple (& Relevant)

The most prominent idea under this theme is that the message needs to be as brief as possible, and conveyed in simple, clear, jargon-free language. One participant noted,

> We started out with something too long so I think you need to make it simple. And you need to talk their language because I'm not a librarian and I came in and was like what is all this jargon? . . . Don't use your *green and gold* and *scholarly communications* and weird terms. What are we talking about these weird terms? Just call it, if it is boot call it a boot. Just call it what people out there would call it. I think it needs to be clear, simple. (Participant #4)

This need seems obvious, but it is difficult to achieve in practice. Although OA itself is a simple concept, its details are complex. All participants commented on this complexity, which is itself a consistent underlying theme throughout these results. The participants spoke about the continual challenge of distilling the complexity down into a manageable and relevant message:

> Focus very much on keeping it simple, so when we started off . . . the previous head of department was very big on policy and acronyms and this committee decided this and this committee decided that. What he didn't do is just say here is what you actually have to do step by step. (Participant #7)

The message is often related to what a researcher needs to do to comply with a particular OA policy. Again, the complexity is in the details: what versions of the manuscript to deposit in an IR, acceptable embargo periods, the various Creative Commons licenses, the publishers' policies, etc. These details are important, but they complicate the message. Many U.K. libraries have developed services to reduce the burden on researchers by taking over responsibility for many of these details. This also helps to simplify the communications:

> What's helped us is having a very clear message to the academics what they should do and why. We can say: for funder compliance, and for increasing your citations, deposit on acceptance. We'll do the rest. That's been quite successful. The easier the message is, the better. (Participant #12)

Many participants also noted that messages need to be tied to important developments or timelines, such as new funder policy announcements or approaching deadlines, to grab the researchers' attention. If the message does not have immediate relevance, the researchers are less likely to pay attention to it.

> We've been able to tie messages to significant developments, and we've been able to demonstrate how the library can offer significant value to the faculty, schools, and individual researchers in meeting those new requirements, so whenever we've put together a campaign it's been around something big. (Participant #5)

Some participants recommended using marketing or design professionals to make the message attractive and branded, and to provide advice on the message's optimal timing and delivery:

> Making stuff simple and pretty is successful so you will notice that all of our materials are quite . . . deliberately similar branding. . . . But again it is the same font, make sure it looks attractive. That's one of our big things is we spend a lot of time and energy—in fact we do have a design person we can use for this. (Participant #8)

Be Flexible and Know Your Audience

> I think part of why we've developed this approach of being as flexible as we can is because there really are some things that absolutely work with some departments but won't with others. (Participant #9)

In every kind of communication exercise, it is important to know your audience. Par-

ticipants commented frequently on the need to be flexible or creative in what message to deliver to what audience, and how best to deliver it. This means adapting the delivery's format, focus, or method. The most obvious application of this advice is when addressing researchers in different disciplines:

> It is slightly different in the arts and humanities. It is a smaller group. They publish things like books that are not part of this accept publication time frame. Things are a bit different, so we can cover it a different way. . . . The one-size-fits-all doesn't work. (Participant #8)

It is not only researchers who need to hear messages about OA, however. The less apparent, but equally important, groups are composed of those who lead or support the researchers on campus: administrators, policy-makers, department heads, and research support staff. Often, the focus of the message needs to be quite different for these groups:

> What we've worked out is that the high-level staff, what you need to do is not talk about the process, not talk about this kind of data, you need to say, "you guys are only 40% compliant, you need to get your act together," and they are all "oh I better do something then." The researchers don't care if you say "40% compliance"—they could care less. You deliver different messages to different groups of people. (Participant #8)

Being flexible may extend to developing creative ways to incorporate the message into other events or communications on other topics. This approach can be particularly effective for unpalatable outreach topics such as copyright:

> A lot of the outreach certainly I've been doing in this role has almost been outreach by stealth, so it's been around kind of integrating open access and particularly copyright. . . . Copyright is the other thing that nobody ever wants to talk about, and you can't go to a department and say, "I would like half an hour to talk to your academics about copyright" and they all just look at you and you're like "why would I waste my time with that?" So a lot of it has been around integrating that kind of outreach activities into other things we're doing. (Participant #9)

> We also do outreach with liaison librarians. They know their departments, and they sometimes forward information on, say, new databases we've subscribed to, and they can sneak open access information in. (Participant #12)

Flexibility can mean adapting your delivery methods too. So be willing to convey your mes-

sage to groups, but also to individuals as needed:

> I think that the best way to explain to do advocacy work regarding open access . . . is to speak to them individually, but I think it will be useful to have first or if possible two meetings initially larger meetings that will include the entire department. . . . In my experience people are not very open to express their feelings, their doubts, their questions/comments, in a big meeting. Particularly if [the] head of school or research or someone important is present. (Participant #2)

Knowing your audience includes preparing for potential skeptics and challengers in advance. Try to anticipate what their concerns might be, or find someone in the department who might be able to inform you, so that you can arrive with a response and solutions to issues:

> Find your champions, but also equally find your anti-champions because forewarned is forearmed going into departmental meetings. Know who they're likely to be and also know what kinds of things that they are likely to be saying, because there is nothing worse than having had a great departmental meeting . . . to then find that actually you can't answer one of the difficult questions that one of your anti-champions has chucked at you, because it can undermine all of the good you have done. (Participant #9)

> So if you can find somebody who has quite an influential administrative position within a department they are really very useful for us because they will tell you about the current opinion on your service, and what is working and isn't working. Taking that as kind of a broker on the language that is useful to use in that department, the sensitivities around certain issues. (Participant #10)

I will explore this idea about champions and informants further under the Key Contacts and Relationships theme.

Repetition and Persistence

> Start early because you always have to tell people more times than you think you do (Participant #7).

Participants repeatedly mentioned the need for repetition. Perhaps this speaks to basic human forgetfulness, which may be heightened in our current environment of information overload and distraction where messages from many different sources compete for our lim-

ited attention. People often need to hear a message several times before they understand it and act upon it:

> I found certainly with open access is that you need to tell somebody something three times in three different ways every three months before they actually start really remembering it. (Participant #9)

Timing is also important. If the message is not immediately relevant to an individual the first time it is delivered, they will disregard it. So, deliver a message often and repeat it often—even to the same audiences. But delivering it the same way each time risks it being tuned out. Hopefully, the message will eventually reach an individual when they are most receptive to it:

> You need to shake it up a little bit to make sure that people are still paying attention because obviously if you keep telling people the same thing again and again then they just fade into the background wallpaper. (Participant #7)

Taking this limitation into account, understand that the message may take time to spread and sink in before you'll see uptake and results. Persistence and patience are necessary. What we are ultimately talking about here is a cultural shift, and academia is notoriously averse to change. It takes time for people to change their behaviors:

> It's a difficult problem to change research practices, doesn't happen overnight; it takes a war of attrition to make changes and you have to keep at it. If there was a magic bullet or a magic wand that was going to solve it, that would be fantastic, but we haven't found that yet. (Participant #10)

Theme 2: Key Contacts and Relationships

> It might be [that] the head of the department needs to take ownership. We do notice that if the head takes ownership things happen. (Participant #8)

Identify Influencers and Informers

Identifying and connecting with key contacts on campus is critical. All participants stressed the importance of reaching out to high-level administrators and department heads. Because these *influencers* have considerable clout over researchers, they can help amplify your message by drawing attention to it and lending it authority:

> I think it is important to get the message through to research directors in order to get buy-in from the faculties. And having top-level, university-level buy-in to those messages as well is very important. That doesn't necessarily mean that academics on the ground will buy into it, but it gives you a stronger message when you go out and talk to people I think. And it also sometimes gives you routes into a faculty. (Participant #6)

> In general, we have more traction in the departments where the head of the departments engage more with us, and where we can send messages and the message comes from head of department. (Participant #12)

Identify these key influencers early and get them onside, ensure they understand and support what you are doing, and if possible, let important messages come from them initially (especially if they are about compliance). Having a senior administrator or department head convey an important message gets researchers' attention so that they will be more receptive when you reach out with subsequent messaging about support and services:

> I think they are just able to get the message out better than . . . we were. Maybe if it came from the head of schools because, we can only give advice and "this is what you should be doing" and softly approach, but maybe at school level they can be a bit more "this is what you have to do." (Participant #1)

> And I think we're lucky because we have such a good relationship with them, so a lot of the edicts, the really heavy-handed stuff to a certain extent, is coming from them, and is coming from heads of departments. . . . And because they'd started with such, with the heavy hand as it were, I was able to come in afterwards and say: "here [are] all the ways the library is going to make your life easier, here is everything we can do to help." (Participant #9)

Some participants suggested that it may be best to have one of the library's senior administrators bring important messages to their counterpart in the university administration first. Often, their established relationship can open the door:

> The library director would go to the most senior faculty committee meetings and say "Okay, this is important." (Participant #5)

However, one participant cautioned that outreach should not be limited to the top administrators because the message may not go any further. It is equally important to find other key administrators or staff embedded in departments. Such individuals might not have as

much power and influence, but they have a wealth of information and connections that will help you reach researchers. These *informers* can help you identify opportunities for spreading your message, and enable you to make connections you might otherwise not have been able to:

> It's so absolutely crucial you get your partnerships with your faculty or with the senior administrative colleagues in those departments to help pave the way for you. That's the way it's worked for us. The people who I'm talking about . . . they are all very senior administrative staff, if you like, they're not academics. They are the ones who are in touch with all the right committees and that will be a mixture of administrative and research and academic staff. They are then rolling it out for us and with us. (Participant #11)

These key informers may include administrative personnel such as research or communications officers, financial managers, or departmental support staff. In addition to helping you make connections with researchers, they can also alert you to potential concerns to prepare for when interacting with a particular group:

> I guess the interaction, the advocacy or the interventions most useful is finding a key person in a department, this key administrator who can help you come into the department and know about the concerns, know about the best way in to get your message there. (Participant #10)

Liaison or subject librarians can also be key contacts or informers. They can apprise you of current culture and research trends in the various departments that they support. Additionally, they usually have established relationships with faculty and can help you connect with departments or individual researchers:

> Quite often if we went to a department it might be the librarian who has arranged it, so if we went to chemistry we'd probably expect the chemistry librarian to be there. (Participant #7)

These librarians can be effective partners in spreading your message through their established communication channels. A quotation in the first theme above notes how liaison librarians can include OA messages in their communications to researchers on other topics. They can be the first contact for any SC questions from their areas before referring the more complex questions on.

> They [liaison librarians] are probably a route into committees, so if there is a

message we want to give out and it probably wouldn't be a top-level message, we wouldn't do something so important in this way, they can deliver messages fairly frequently, we would create the message and pass it on to them to deliver. What they can't do is answer questions particularly about that because they don't have the level of knowledge that we do. (Participant #6)

Cultivate Champions and Good News Stories

Influencers can also come in the form of local champions: those researchers in a department who already make their research OA (and hopefully have experienced the benefits) and who can then speak personally to the topic. Often researchers will listen to respected colleagues or peers before those outside of their departments or disciplines:

A few academics here are very active in terms of promoting open access. That goes well, because if it comes from an academic in the department it's always seen more positively than if it comes from the library or research office, which people normally associate with grant applications and compliance—particularly compliance is not an exciting topic for anyone. (Participant #12)

There were a couple of people in the audience who had had really good experiences, one lady who'd, who'd made her work available open access and she'd been able to say to her colleagues: well I did it and I've seen a noticeable uptick in my citations. Genuinely I could've hugged her, because that was totally off the cuff, I had no idea she was going to say that but genuinely it was like absolutely the best thing I could've hoped for to have happened. Because it's those kinds of stories that are going to be convincing because I've been doing this for six years now, I can articulate the benefits 'til I'm blue in the face but until the academics actually see it for themselves or for their colleagues they're still always going to treat what I'm saying with a bit of a pinch of salt to a certain extent. (Participant #9)

Similarly, good news stories can encourage researchers to switch to OA. A few participants mentioned that they had plans to develop a promotional campaign highlighting local researchers' positive experiences with OA:

Having the good news stories makes a huge difference. Being able to say how many times this thesis has been used and stuff that Harvard is doing the good news stories, that sort of stuff really makes a massive difference. (Participant #8)

We need some role models up there who are being seen to do this. . . . Something

we can maybe look at is good news stories. If professor x, who's the head of the particular division or something, if they are seen to be doing depositing [in the repository] then you can follow their lead. (Participant #11)

Early Career Researchers

Some will get it, generally the younger ones get it, the older ones might be reluctant or may not get it at all. Humans by nature are opposing change so it is not easy. (Participant #2)

Several participants mentioned the importance of focusing outreach efforts on one key group in particular: early career researchers. They may be more open to new directions in SC, and have not yet established a rigid publishing routine. If incorporating open practices into researchers' publishing workflows is the goal, then focusing on this younger group is a strategic choice:

It is the people who are just starting off who are more likely to shape their publication processes to do what we need them to do rather than some professor who has been doing things the same way for 40 years and is going to retire in two or three years anyways so doesn't see the point. Also, often those kind of professors give it to the post-docs or students to do anyways so they are going to be the ones who are actually doing it. (Participant #7)

Build (& Track) Relationships

"We do find that . . . making personal connections works really well" (Participant #9).

Identifying key individuals on campus will do little good if you cannot also cultivate a mutually beneficial working relationship with them. One participant spoke of the importance of "creating rapport" with key contacts and researchers, and the word *relationship* was mentioned frequently alongside this topic. Another participant spoke of her colleague, another OA practitioner:

He has been talking to the same people and faculty support teams for a very long time and those relationships are very strong. (Participant #6)

Forging a more personal relationship with key contacts will help maintain the connection. The best way to accomplish this seems to be actually interacting in person.

> Continuing to go out and talk to people and having good connections at school level has been really helpful and at college level just keeping that communicating going with them. (Participant #1)

> Face to face is good, you get people who do remember the service, do remember your name which is a really useful part of that, people feel they have contact as well as just a generic email address. (Participant #3)

Beyond building relationships, you also might want to collaborate with other research support units on campus.

> No single sector could do it alone. That's been really clear. We've all got our partnership role to play. It's been a really great way to get to know these people in other areas of the university and see what we can do for them, and what they can do for us, and how we can progress it together. For us it has been, initially, the partnership between the libraries and the research services people on the ground. (Participant #11)

On a large campus with many schools, departments, and support units, one might quickly become overwhelmed with the number of key contacts they have identified and formed connections with. A tracking system can keep information on these relationships organized: individuals' contact details and responsibilities, topics discussed (and dates), any special concerns or situations, etc. Also try to keep track of when key contacts leave their positions and who replaces them. Two participants (from different institutions) spontaneously mentioned this idea of tracking relationships during the interviews. Neither had found the ideal solution, but spoke keenly about the need for it:

> What we are trying to do right now is work out who have we talked to, trying to get some picture of that. And I am thinking we are going to need some sort of sales program to help us with this so that you know that that was the last time you contacted anybody from the Department of Medicine and it was this person, an administrator, but now they've left so now you need to talk to—you know what I mean, so it is complicated, really, really complicated. (Participant #8)

Tracking not only improves efficiency in your interactions (i.e., so you aren't covering the same ground during each meeting!), but may also help you prepare for the meetings as discussed above (i.e., by remembering the key concerns or situations of importance to the individual or group):

Find some way of making notes of these kinds of, of the interactions you've had, who did you speak to, who, who contacted you, how did that kind of interaction come about. I mean we're doing it fairly unsystematically, if we ever had something like a customer relations management system or whatever, that would be brilliant . . . just to track all of the various different interactions that we've had with people. Because it can be a great resource for yourself to go back and see, well I went to that departmental meeting and I got these difficult questions so these are the questions I need to prepare for . . . going forward. It can help preparing yourself if you've got to go into the departments. (Participant #9)

Theme 3: Qualities of the OA Practitioner

Although this study focuses on the outreach strategies and practices, and not the individual providing the services, the participants often mentioned or implied certain personal characteristics that were helpful in their roles. The first, and most important, was depth of knowledge.

Expertise & Credibility

The challenges associated with the level of complexity and the rapid pace of change in the SC realm were mentioned frequently in the interviews. OA practitioners need to have more than a superficial level of knowledge to successfully raise awareness on campus. Depth of knowledge is critical because researchers like to discuss the details!

> One of our library strategic objectives is to be expert research partners and so now it starts to feel like yes, we are that. When I go to meetings with administrators from the faculties and talk about open access they very often say, "I am so glad you are doing it because it is so complicated," and they are right. But again you don't realize how much you know and how locally expert you are until you have those conversations with other people. (Participant #6)

Participants spoke about the tension between the actual compliance tasks and finding time for outreach. To become more knowledgeable, the OA practitioner needs to have enough free time to keep up with this quickly changing SC ecosystem. Therefore, it is necessary to have several team members: some to focus on the compliance tasks such as facilitating APC payments or deposits into the IR and creating the reports; and some at the higher level to focus on outreach and communications as well as maintaining a high level of awareness and expertise in SC:

> Offer a very high-quality service, develop service level agreements, make sure all staff on the team are knowledgeable and can help people in meaningful ways and because anything can really go viral in an institution either positive or negative so it is important those first few interactions are really positive so then you can rely on word-of-mouth behavior across the institution. . . . I think that was useful for us that we were lucky enough to have good people in the team who knew what they were talking about. Training and staff is vital. (Participant #5)

> And to have to back up that communications with the service or the help that is actually credible and correct as well. If we are saying, "Come to us if you have questions," then we need to be able to help them quickly and reliably, and make sure people dealing with those things are equipped and skilled to do it. That's the other area behind the scenes, to try to make sure that's how library colleagues, subject librarians particularly, are up to speed enough to take a query and deal with it or pass it on appropriately, and learn along the way. (Participant #11)

Some researchers will challenge or test your expertise before they accept you as an expert on this topic. The response may have repercussions with the group going forward, so there is considerable pressure on OA practitioners to be well prepared and knowledgeable:

> It also makes for some very fascinating discussions, and they are almost testing you, I think. Academics will sometimes test you as somebody trying to sell the message and once they realize you probably know more than they do then I think they start to buy in a little bit more and trust in your service and what you can offer them. But it has felt like that quite often: that we aren't just clerical assistants going out to talk about a process, we are talking about huge scholarly communication issues, actually. (Participant #6)

One participant also spoke about the benefit of hiring individuals with advanced degrees and research experience to advise faculty on their publishing activities:

> The idea was to employ people who—we've got lots of PhDs out there who are people who can talk to researchers about research and have some credibility here. (Participant #8)

Diplomacy and Perseverance

Navigating the SC complexity is further complicated by the politics involved—which has complexity of its own. OA can still be a contentious topic, and since the OA practitioner is

likely the most knowledgeable person on campus in this area, they are drawn into institutional politics. So diplomacy, tactfulness, persuasiveness, and other such traits are valuable:

> There are all sorts of politics on a national scale. Then there are the politics within the institution, which is complex and I am still working it out. . . . There is a lot of that sort of university politics involved in the job. And then there is the library politics and that is a whole other kettle of fish. (Participant #8)

Perseverance is also necessary. As discussed in Theme 1, messages need to be continually repeated and OA misconceptions countered. OA outreach is a long game of changing academic culture. Don't expect to change publishing behavior quickly. The process can be discouraging, and it can lead to OA practitioner burnout:

> It really is just a case, it's going to be a long process, and I think certainly for me when I first started out I rather naively assumed that once I'd convinced the majority of people in one department that was it, that was that department sorted, and you do find that after certain interactions you will see this uptick, this spike of contact, and a spike of engagement of services and people start following the right procedures and so forth but that really quite quickly decays. (Participant #9)

Theme 4: Advocacy versus Compliance

> Compliance is essential, so it's the important part at the moment (Participant #3).

In the United Kingdom, monitoring and ensuring compliance to funders' mandates has mostly fallen to the libraries. This is mainly because they are the units on campus that have developed and managed the IR infrastructure, and because they already manage vendor relationships and handle publishers' invoices. Compliance often involves library workers depositing manuscripts in the IR or paying APCs to publishers. Most of the participants thought the library should naturally offer the SC services. "If not the library, then who?" was a common response. Other units on campus generally do not have any interest or expertise in this area:

> Well I don't think there is any question at this moment that we are in the best position to help people with interpreting the policies of funders, and I don't think there is an appetite across the institution for anybody to take over from the library's role in providing that kind of support. (Participant #5)

But, there is uneasiness with the library being the one wielding the "stick" to ensure com-

pliance. The participants felt that the more heavy-handed messages should be delivered by administrators who have more authority to deliver them. The library can then provide assistance. The carrot and stick analogy was mentioned often in the interviews:

> So I think that is a very good move that HEFCE is using open access, [that] it's a requirement, because in the past for 15–20 years there is so much advocacy for open access but with very little success. . . . In my experience [the] stick is a little bit more efficient than [the] carrot especially when working with academics. (Participant #2)

However, many participants expressed frustration that the compliance message has overtaken the advocacy role. The overall sentiment was that, with limited time and attention span for messages, compliance is the critical part. On the positive side though, funder mandates and the HEFCE REF exercise have finally focused attention on OA after years of advocacy outreach making little difference:

> It's sadly, in some way, it's a grudging thing, like we have to do this for compliance. I would prefer if they'd realize what the benefits are, but now that we've got the attention on the compliance we have much better resources. We can get the benefit message out as well. It's really focused the whole sector. It's focused the minds of suppliers, and some other funders. It's made open access a much more prominent topic, and it's increased the open access rate of the U.K. significantly, certainly over the last year. (Participant #12)

The danger here, of course, is that OA will become just another administrative burden in the minds of faculty already overwhelmed by administrative tasks. The conflict for the participants is clear. The funder mandates and REF exercise are finally motivating researchers to act and make their papers OA. But at what cost?

> I'm really nervous that this is what it's going to end up being seen as . . . that open access is purely a box-ticking compliance exercise. (Participant #9)

DISCUSSION

Concise and Clear Messaging

A main finding in this study is that messages need to be as concise and as clear as possible with limited jargon. Even the term *open access* itself is still jargon in many cases (Cirasella, 2017). Do not assume faculty understand it in the same way you do. Researchers are busy

people with many demands on their time; therefore a short, to-the-point message that easily relates to their immediate needs will be most effective.

Vandegrift and Colvin (2012) also suggest maintaining a consistent and simple message, and "creating policies and procedures for sharing scholarly communication information" that ensure the message on OA is clear (p. 388). The United Kingdom has multiple funder policies on OA, each with different requirements for compliance. The need to simplify the complexity for faculty dominates the messaging—along with compliance. Compliance is critically important to ensure future funding, not just for the individual researcher but for the institution as well. This is quite a different atmosphere than in North America.

Although Canada and the United States both have major funder OA policies, their institutional policies are not nearly as complex or compliance focused as the United Kingdom's. We have the luxury of focusing our messaging differently. Otto (2016) encourages librarians, when delivering OA outreach messages, to "shift the focus outward, to the governing objectives of universal open access, the academic and institutional missions, and the advancement of research and societal good" (p. 29). She agrees that the message needs to be clear and concise, but stresses that it should also speak to faculty values (Otto, 2016). Faculty need to be convinced that they should make their research OA before they need messaging on the step-by-step process. But, as some participants noted, we have been advocating about the public good of OA for more than a decade now with limited uptake from researchers.

What the focus of the message should be for maximum impact warrants further investigation and discussion. Both aspects—the need for OA research and how to make research OA—likely need to be communicated to researchers, possibly at different times or to different audiences. This relates to another finding of this study—adapting the message for the audience.

Know Your Audience

It is critical that OA practitioners adjust their message depending on their audience. If your goal is to convince the audience that OA is a good thing, then consider the various arguments related to their discipline or position that might sway them (i.e., as a researcher, administrator, or student). Cirasella (2017) advises OA advocates to "speak in terms meaningful to your audience, with examples and enticements relevant to them" (p. 326). Some audiences are already convinced that OA is a good thing; or simply need to comply with institutional or funder mandates. In these cases, outreach needs to continue past the arguments; we need to be ready to guide individuals in putting theory into practice (Cirasella, 2017).

Repeat and Persist

Participants mentioned the need for continual reiteration of the message. Researchers need to hear the message several times, and possibly in multiple ways, before they act. Catching them at a key moment, such as when they are in process of submitting a paper or simply have some free time to consider the message, may help. This repetition can be tedious for OA practitioners and could lead to burnout. As participants noted, perseverance will be key. Kenney (2015) points out that "change takes longer than you think it should. The uptake for open access (OA) on Minnesota's campus, for example, remained modest for years despite the library's sustained efforts" (p. 387).

The Imperative of Influencers and Informers

The participants repeatedly highlighted the importance of key contacts, and in particular, support from individuals in positions of power on campus, such as administrators and department heads. These influencers can compel faculty to act, or at least pay attention to the message. Indeed, in Jisc's OA good practice handbook, Blanchett and DeGroff (2016) assert that "key stakeholder buy-in is essential. This supports your message and adds weight to the requirement for others to engage" (p. 21). This seems to be a critical strategy that many have identified. Duncan et al. (2013) attribute their Copyright Committee's success to the immediate support and endorsement from top-level university administrators, which validated the initiative and raised the committee's profile among faculty. Kenney (2015) emphasizes that "reaching deans, department chairs, or faculty leaders may reap huge benefits in spreading the word" (p. 388). Vandegrift and Colvin (2012) also stress the importance of involving influential faculty and administrators: "Strategizing outreach methods becomes a political task, as well as a public relations one" (p. 387).

Expertise Is Essential

Expertise and depth of knowledge is perhaps the most critical quality required for OA practitioners. Vandegrift and Colvin (2012) note that, before initiating any OA outreach program, it is vitally important "to understand the issues and the current state of scholarly publishing and the direction in which it's moving" (p. 386). Similarly, the first of NASIG's (2017) four themes is Background Knowledge: "The foremost commonality is deep knowledge of the Open Access movement and its impact on the scholarly publishing landscape" (p. 2).

The challenge here is time. SC is a complex and quickly moving field with new developments arising daily. Monitoring these developments in the depth needed to maintain

expertise is almost a full-time job in itself. But it is essential. As participants indicated, OA practitioners are likely to be tested and challenged. If they cannot respond effectively, and with accurate, detailed information, they may lose credibility with the faculty. Typically, SC librarians at North American institutions wear many hats, often acting as IR managers, copyright officers, and OA outreach leads. Finding the time to develop and maintain expertise to be effective in outreach is challenging.

Credibility: Librarians as Researchers . . . and as Faculty

One participant mentioned that her library is now hiring (nonlibrarian) individuals with PhDs specifically because they are better able to establish credibility with faculty when discussing research. This decision makes intuitive sense. Participating in research and publishing allows OA practitioners to empathize more with the researchers they support and to provide advice based on actual experience. However, this development also hints at the persistent disconnect between librarians and teaching faculty based on academic status and education level (Anthony, 2010; Christiansen, Stombler, & Thaxton, 2004). Even if librarians have faculty status and a publication record, teaching faculty often do not consider them as peers, although these attributes may strengthen the relationships over time (Galbraith, Garrison, & Hales, 2016; Holbrook, 2015). And librarians themselves may perpetuate this disconnect by seeing faculty as superior because of their credentials or status. As Malenfant (2010) states,

> this mindset poses a significant challenge for creating an atmosphere of mutuality and shared action to change such a large system as scholarly communication. Librarians have to think differently about themselves as partners with faculty in the research enterprise and not servants. (p. 74)

In North American institutions, most OA practitioners are librarians, so these underlying tensions may partially explain why they often struggle with OA outreach to researchers. This is an intriguing insight and requires additional study.

Much of the inertia in advancing real, transformative change in the SC system is due to the (actual and perceived) tenure and promotion requirements placed on faculty. These include the emphasis on publishing in conventional, prestigious, high-impact journals. Librarians with faculty status have direct, firsthand experience of the tenure and promotion processes from developing their own case files and reviewing those of others. They are thus better able to commiserate with other faculty regarding the pressures and requirements they face. The benefits of this are twofold: strengthening relationships and credibility, and being able to work toward progressive change in the tenure and promotion requirements from within institutional structures.

If librarians hold faculty status, they can participate more fully in university governance. This is possibly its greatest benefit (Galbraith et al., 2016). By serving on their institution's governance bodies, librarians can positively influence policy on issues related to OA and SC and convey their expertise in these areas to the teaching faculty and administrators (Mullen & Otto, 2014). Raising librarians' profiles as researchers and as faculty (where applicable) may increase their credibility with other faculty—making faculty more responsive to OA outreach efforts.

Other Qualities or Skills

In developing my interview questions, I did not consider asking the participants about personal qualities that they think are important for OA practitioners. Despite this, the topic came up in the conversations. Diplomacy and perseverance or persistence were qualities mentioned in the interviews; the literature lists some further characteristics.

The NASIG (2017) Core Competencies report states that SC librarians should be "dynamic and adaptive to accommodate the nature of scholarly communication" (p. 11). They should have strong collaboration and communication skills (oral and written), and be enthusiastic, ambitious, comfortable with change and ambiguity, and personable (NASIG, 2017). In discussing the staffing of IRs, Nabe (2010) argues that IR outreach is similar to "salesmanship," requiring the same set of skills: boldness, knowledge, persuasiveness, persistence, and flexibility (p. 24–25). OA practitioners often engage in IR promotion, so this skill set is especially relevant and overlaps with some of the traits that emerged from this study.

The Burdens and Tensions of Compliancy Outreach

There is a tension between ensuring compliance with funder policies and needing time for advocacy to promote the public good of a transition to OA. Compliance is a tedious, burdensome, time-consuming task for faculty. Participants often spoke of trying to relieve this burden on researchers. According to a recent U.K. study, "over 90% of academics were extremely unhappy with the level of administration they are required to undertake and the level of bureaucracy within the university" (Darabi, Macaskill, & Reidy, 2016, p. 4). So, OA policies are increasing administrative burdens on already overwhelmed researchers, but they are also the only effective means to motivate them to act. The carrot-and-stick analogy came up repeatedly in the interviews, with most of the participants grudgingly admitting that the stick is more effective in the end.

Librarians are often placed in the awkward position of working towards a more sustainable SC ecosystem while being obliged to enforce the licenses they've signed with legacy publish-

ers in the current system: "We work for reform and enforce the current system in the same breath" (Sterman, 2017, p. 372). Outreach efforts around copyright face similar dilemmas: "How do we educate about the limits while promoting the possibilities?" (Duncan et al., 2013, p. 282).

We are certainly in the midst of a major transition in the scholarly publishing system. Librarians have an opportunity to become influential "change agents" in the transition to this new and more sustainable system (Mullen & Otto, 2014). Of the numerous motivations for OA, one of the most compelling is social justice (Glushko & Shoyama, 2015; Heller & Gaede, 2016). Many universities have public-good missions, and libraries have always tried to democratize access to information, so it is not surprising that SC librarians and OA practitioners struggle with the dual role of advocate and enforcer.

Focusing our message on compliance with funder policies misses an opportunity to raise researchers' awareness about OA's enormous potential to advance scholarship and the public good. Researchers have considerable power to influence change in the current dysfunctional scholarly publishing environment.

CONCLUSION

Informal conversation among SC librarians and other OA practitioners often reveals the struggles they have to communicate to researchers about OA. The purpose of this study was to determine effective outreach practices and strategies that help raise researchers' awareness about OA, their funders' policies, and the services available to support them in making their research products OA.

I categorized the findings under four key themes: The Message; Key Contacts and Relationships; Qualities of the OA Practitioner; and Advocacy versus Compliance. To summarize:

1. The Message

   • Make messages as brief as possible, and use simple, clear, jargon-free language.
   • Tie the messages to important developments or timelines, if applicable.
   • Make the messages flexible or creative in format and content; and adapt them to suit the audience (either by discipline or the person's role in the institution).
   • Deliver the messages often, and repeat them often, but not necessarily in exactly the same way or you risk being tuned out.

2. Key Contacts and Relationships

- Identify potential *influencers*. These individuals have considerable clout over researchers; they can help amplify your message by drawing attention to it and giving it authority (e.g., high-level administrators, department heads).

- Identify potential *informers*. These individuals can help you find opportunities for spreading your message, and enable you to make connections you might otherwise not have been able to (e.g., departmental support staff, liaison librarians). They can also inform you about the specific concerns in that area.

- Cultivate *champions*. These are another type of influencer: peers of the researcher who can speak personally (and positively) to the topic of OA. Sometimes the information gets more attention if it is delivered by a respected colleague.

- Build relationships with all of these key contacts. A personal connection helps to maintain the interaction and increases the likelihood of positive results.

3. Qualities of the OA Practitioner

- Deep knowledge and expertise in SC is crucial in order to build credibility with researchers. Advanced degrees and research experience may also establish the OA practitioner's credibility to advise faculty on publishing.

- Perseverance is necessary. Messages need to be repeated and OA misconceptions countered—constantly. OA practitioners need to be persistent.

- Diplomacy is also needed. OA is political: at the library level, at the institutional level, and at the national level. As the institution's most knowledgeable person, the OA practitioner will be drawn into these politics.

4. Advocacy versus Compliance

- With limited time and attention span, messages about compliance with mandates may overtake advocacy about the public good of OA.

- The danger is that OA will become just another administrative burden in the minds of faculty already overwhelmed by administrative tasks.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

REFERENCES

Alire, C. A. (2007). Word-of-mouth marketing: Abandoning the academic library ivory tower. New Library World, 108(11/12), 545–551. https://doi.org/10.1108/03074800710838272

Anthony, K. (2010). Reconnecting the disconnects: Library outreach to faculty as addressed in the literature. College & Undergraduate Libraries, 17(1), 79–92. https://doi.org/10.1080/10691310903584817

Bazeley, J. W., Waller, J., & Resnis, E. (2014). Engaging faculty in scholarly communication change: A learning community approach. Journal of Librarianship and Scholarly Communication, 2(3), p.eP1129. https://doi.org/10.7710/2162-3309.1129

Blanchett, H., & DeGroff, H. (2016). Moving open access implementation forward: A handbook for open access good practice based on experiences of U.K. higher education institutions. Bristol, U.K. Retrieved from http://repository.jisc.ac.uk/6565/1/JISC_OAGP_OUTPUTS_HANDBOOK_FINAL.PDF

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3(2), 77–101. https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa

Christiansen, L., Stombler, M., & Thaxton, L. (2004). A report on librarian-faculty relations from a sociological perspective. The Journal of Academic Librarianship, 30(2), 116–121. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2004.01.003

Cirasella, J. (2017). Open access outreach: SMASH vs. suasion. College & Research Libraries News, 78(6), 323–326. https://doi.org/10.5860/crln.78.6.323

Corbett, H. (2009). The crisis in scholarly communication, part I: Understanding the issues and engaging your faculty. Technical Services Quarterly, 26(2), 125–134. https://doi.org/10.1080/07317130802268522

Courtney, N. (2009). Breaking out of our shell: Expanding the definition of outreach in academic libraries. In N. Courtney (Ed.), Academic library outreach: Beyond the campus walls (pp. 1–6). Westport, CT: Libraries Unlimited.

Darabi, M., Macaskill, A., & Reidy, L. (2016). A qualitative study of the UK academic role: Positive features, negative aspects and associated stressors in a mainly teaching-focused university. Journal of Further and Higher Education, 9486(4), 1–15. https://doi.org/10.1080/0309877X.2016.1159287

Dawson, D. (2014). The scholarly communications needs of faculty: An evidence-based foundation for the development of library services. Evidence Based Library and Information Practice, 9(4), 4–28. https://doi.org/10.18438/B8R88C

Duncan, J., Clement, S., & Rozum, B. (2013). Teaching our faculty: Developing copyright and scholarly communication outreach programs. In S. Davis-Kahl & M. K. Hensley (Eds.), Common ground at the nexus of information literacy and scholarly communication (pp. 269–285). Chicago, IL: Association of College and Research Libraries. Retrieved from https://www.ideals.illinois.edu/bitstream/handle/2142/42666/CommonGround_OA.pdf?sequence=2#page=284

Eva, N. (2015). Marketing to faculty in an academic library. Reference & User Services Quarterly, 54(4), 26. https://doi.org/10.5860/rusq.54n4.26

Finch, J. (2012). Accessibility, sustainability, excellence: How to expand access to research publications. Retrieved from https://www.acu.ac.uk/research-information-network/finch-report-final

Ford, E. (2009). Outreach is (un)dead. Retrieved from http://www.inthelibrarywiththeleadpipe.org/2009/outreach-is-undead/

Fruin, C. (2017). Organization and delivery of scholarly communication services by academic and research libraries in the United Kingdom: Observations from across the pond. Journal of Librarianship and Scholarly Communication, 5(1), p. eP2157. https://doi.org/10.7710/2162-3309.2157

Galbraith, Q., Garrison, M., & Hales, W. (2016). Perceptions of faculty status among academic librarians. College & Research Libraries, 77(5), 582–594. https://doi.org/10.5860/crl.77.5.582

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

Giesecke, J. (2011). Institutional repositories: Keys to success. Journal of Library Administration, 51(5–6), 529–542. https://doi.org/10.1080/01930826.2011.589340

Glushko, B., & Shoyama, R. (2015). Unpacking open access: A theoretical framework for understanding open access initiatives. Feliciter, 61(1), 8–11/20.

Goger, L. K. (2015). Conversations: Building relationships and using constituent voice in outreach. In R. J. Lackie & M. S. Wood (Eds.), Creative library marketing and publicity: Best practices (pp. 17–29). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Government of Canada. (2016). Tri-Agency Open Access Policy on Publications. Retrieved from http://www.science.gc.ca/eic/site/063.nsf/eng/h_F6765465.html

Hahn, K. L. (2008). Talk about talking about new models of scholarly communication. The Journal of Electronic Publishing, 11(1). https://doi.org/10.3998/3336451.0011.108

Heller, M., & Gaede, F. (2016). Measuring altruistic impact: A model for understanding the social justice of open access. Journal of Librarianship and Scholarly Communication, 4, p.eP2132. https://doi.org/10.7710/2162-3309.2132

Higher Education Funding Council of England (HEFCE). (2015). Policy for open access in the post-2014 Research Excellence Framework. Retrieved from http://www.hefce.ac.uk/pubs/year/2014/201407/

Holbrook, J. B. (2015). We scholars: How libraries could help us with scholarly publishing, if only we'd let them. In M. Bonn & M. Furlough (Eds.), Getting the word out: Academic libraries as scholarly publishers (pp. 43–54). Chicago, IL: Association of College & Research Libraries. Retrieved from http://hdl.handle.net/1853/53207

Jisc. (2016). Open access good practice. Retrieved from https://www.jisc.ac.uk/rd/projects/open-access-good-practice

Jisc, Newcastle University, the University of Nottingham, & University College London. (2015). Advocating open access – a toolkit for librarians and research support staff. Retrieved from http://blogs.ucl.ac.uk/open-access/files/2015/06/Advocacy-toolkit.pdf

Johnson, P. C. (2014). International Open Access Week at small to medium U.S. academic libraries: The first five years. The Journal of Academic Librarianship, 40(6), 626–631. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2014.07.011

Kenney, A. R. (2015). From engaging liaison librarians to engaging communities. College & Research Libraries, 76(3), 386–391. https://doi.org/10.5860/crl.76.3.386

Kotter, W. R. (1999). Bridging the great divide: Improving relations between librarians and classroom faculty. The Journal of Academic Librarianship, 25(4), 294–303. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0099-1333(99)80030-5

Lawton, A. (2016). Communicating the open access message: A case study from Ireland. New Review of Academic Librarianship, 22(1), 60–77. https://doi.org/10.1080/13614533.2015.1127832

Madsen, D. L., & Oleen, J. K. (2013). Staffing and workflow of a maturing institutional repository. Journal of Librarianship and Scholarly Communication, 1(3), p.eP1063. https://doi.org/10.7710/2162-3309.1063

Malenfant, K. J. (2010). Leading change in the system of scholarly communication: A case study of engaging liaison librarians for outreach to faculty. College & Research Libraries, 71(1), 63–76. https://doi.org/10.5860/0710063

McDevitt, T. (2013). Reaching out to the university community: Careers in library outreach. In R. Peacock & J. Wurm (Eds.), The new academic librarian: Essays on changing roles and responsibilities (pp. 46–58). Jefferson, NC: McFarland.

McDonald, B., Gibson, I., Yates, E., & Stephenson, C. (2016). An exploration of faculty experiences with open access journal publishing at two Canadian comprehensive universities. Partnership: The Canadian Journal of Library and Information Practice and Research, 11(2), 1–26. https://doi.org/10.21083/partnership.v11i2.3703

Mercer, H., Rosenblum, B., & Emmett, A. (2007). A multifaceted approach to promote a university repository: The University of Kansas' experience. OCLC Systems & Services: International Digital Library Perspectives, 23(2), 190–203. https://doi.org/10.1108/10650750710748496

Morris, S., & Thorn, S. (2009). Learned society members and open access. Learned Publishing, 22(3), 221–239. https://doi.org/10.1087/2009308

Mullen, L. B., & Otto, J. J. (2014). Open access policymaking: Roles for academic librarians as "change agents" in research institutions. Qualitative and Quantitative Methods in Libraries, 1, 295–307. Retrieved from http://www.qqml.net/papers/March_2014_Issue/3115QQML_Journal_2014_BoweringMullenJohnsonOtto_295-307.pdf

Nabe, J. (2010). Starting, strengthening, and managing institutional repositories: A how-to-do-it manual. New York, NY: Neal-Schuman.

NASIG. (2017). Core competencies for scholarly communication librarians: Final version. Retrieved from http://www.nasig.org/site_page.cfm?pk_association_webpage_menu=310&pk_association_webpage=9435

Newman, K. A., Blecic, D. D., & Armstrong, K. L. (2007). SPEC kit 299: Scholarly communication education initiatives. Washington, DC: Association of Research Libraries. https://doi.org/10.29242/spec.299

Otto, J. J. (2016). A resonant message: Aligning scholar values and open access objectives in OA policy outreach to faculty and graduate students. Journal of Librarianship and Scholarly Communication, 4, p.eP2152. https://doi.org/10.7710/2162-3309.2152

Potter, N. (2012). The library marketing toolkit. London, U.K.: Facet.

Radom, R., Feltner-Reichert, M., & stringer-stanback, k. (2012). SPEC Kit 332: Organization of scholarly communication services. Washington, DC: Association of Research Libraries. https://doi.org/10.29242/spec.332

Research Councils UK (RCUK). (2013). RCUK policy on open access. Retrieved from http://www.rcuk.ac.uk/research/openaccess/policy/
RCUK. (2015). Review of the implementation of the RCUK policy on open access. Retrieved from http://www.rcuk.ac.uk/documents/documents/openaccessreport-pdf/

Sterman, L. (2017). The enemy of the good: How specifics in publisher's green OA policies are bogging down IR deposits of scholarly literature. College & Research Libraries News, 78(7), 372–374/394/401. https://doi.org/10.5860/crln.78.7.372

Suber, P. (2012). Open access. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. Retrieved from https://mitpress.mit.edu/sites/default/files/titles/content/9780262517638_Open_Access_PDF_Version.pdf

Troll Covey, D. (2011). Recruiting content for the institutional repository: The barriers exceed the benefits. Journal of Digital Information, 12(3), 1–18. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781107415324.004

Vandegrift, M., & Colvin, G. (2012). Relational communications: Developing key connections. College & Research Libraries News, 73(7), 386–389. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.5860/crln.73.7.8790

Wellcome Trust. (2013). Open access policy. Retrieved from https://wellcome.ac.uk/funding/managing-grant/open-access-policy

Wellcome Trust. (2014). Charity open access fund. Retrieved from https://wellcome.ac.uk/funding/managing-grant/charity-open-access-fund

White, M. V. (2002). Information literacy programs: Successful paradigms for stimulating and promoting faculty interest and involvement. The Reference Librarian, 38(79–80), 323–334. https://doi.org/10.1300/J120v38n79_22

Wildemuth, B. M., & Cao, L. L. (2009). Sampling for intensive studies. In B. M. Wildemuth (Ed.), Applications of social research methods to questions in information and library science (pp. 129–137). Westport, CT: Libraries Unlimited.

Wirth, A. (2011). Incorporating existing library partnerships into Open Access Week events. Collaborative Librarianship, 3(4), 197–204. Retrieved from http://digitalcommons.du.edu/collaborativelibrarianship/vol3/iss4/3

Wright, A. M. (2013). Starting scholarly conversations: A scholarly communication outreach program. Journal of Librarianship and Scholarly Communication, 2(1), p.eP1096. https://doi.org/10.7710/2162-3309.1096

Xia, J. (2010). A longitudinal study of scholars' attitudes and behaviors toward open-access journal publishing. Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology, 61(1994), 615–624. https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.21283

Yang, Z. Y. (Lan), & Li, Y. (2015). University faculty awareness and attitudes towards open access publishing and the institutional repository: A case study. Journal of Librarianship and Scholarly Communication, 3(1), eP1210. https://doi.org/10.7710/2162-3309.1210

APPENDIX

Semistructured Interview Guide

**/bolded questions - make sure to ask!

Warm-up:

1. **Please tell me about your role and responsibilities at this institution.**

2. Composition of team responsible.

3. High-level overview of the main scholarly communications services offered (i.e. IR, APC administration, journal hosting, etc.).

Section A: Services offered and by whom

1. Which units on campus offer services to faculty/researchers to support them in complying with the RCUK OA Policy (and funders' OA policies in general)? Which would you say take the lead? **How, in your experience, have these units collaborated/interacted?** [*Probe*: Any lessons learned; success/challenges; or other opinions/examples]

2. **Is the library the best unit to cover these services? Why?**

Section B: Outreach services specifically

I want to focus mainly on any outreach/educational/awareness-raising services you may have offered [to raise awareness of faculty about specific funders' OA policies and/or the services available to support them in complying].

1. **Please tell me about the range of your outreach services <u>and how they evolved</u>?** [*Probe*: stories to tell]

2. ****Can you think of a time when you felt that your educational/outreach efforts really made a difference? … really backfired/counterproductive?** [*Probe*: stories to tell] *Alternate wording:* Please describe any specific services/events that have been particularly successful/unsuccessful in your opinion? What contributed to the success?

3. **Beyond these examples, please tell me your perceptions of the impacts/effects of your outreach/educational efforts.**

   Alternate wording: How do you know if these outreach services were meeting the needs of the researchers? [*Probe*: Examples or stories of this?] (*assessment question*)

Section C: Researchers' needs (Values vs Compliance)

1. **In your experience, what are the greatest scholarly communication needs of researchers?**

Journal of Librarianship and Scholarly Communication

2. ****Is it important to build researchers' awareness of scholarly communication issues? Or should librarians just focus on practical, compliance-related education?**

   Alternate wording: What is the library's role in OA advocacy? Do we try to change the system – or just facilitate compliance?

Wrapping up:

1. **What advice do you have for other institutions planning to implement similar outreach initiatives?** [*Probe*: Any regrets? Things you wish you knew earlier?]

2. **Is there anything more you'd like to tell me or expand on?**