Abstract

Academic libraries are often tasked with open access (OA) policy implementation. Many academic libraries have developed robust workflows that utilize custom-built management tools and receive support from a number of library staff. While such workflows certainly streamline the process, their development and management require significant resources. As the number of smaller institutions with OA policies increases, there is a need for solutions that are efficient, flexible, and can be accomplished with minimal resources. Staff at Rice University’s Fondren Library developed a simple workflow that populates the institutional repository, freeing up time for OA policy outreach and awareness activities.
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Introduction

Open access (OA)—generally, work made freely available online with minimal copyright and licensing restrictions—is changing scholarly communications (Suber 2013). The traditional publishing model has been forever changed. Authors now have more options for sharing their work and participating in the peer-review process. In addition to publishing in open access journals, many authors also post peer-reviewed manuscripts on a number of online venues (“green-” or “self-archiving”).

Naturally, academic libraries actively participate in the OA conversation, as they attempt to combat the “serials crisis” and ensure access to scholarship by anyone with an Internet connection. They lead the development of new technologies, including institutional repositories (IRs), which offer scholars a venue for preserving and making their work freely available online (Buehler and Boateng 2005, 292).

Of course, open access does not reside only in the library environment. It can be applied to almost every aspect of the research environment. Over the past decade, an increasing number of academic institutions have implemented campus-wide open access policies, requiring faculty to place copies of their scholarship in institutional repositories (Xia et al. 2012, 85). In part because of their involvement with OA issues and the development of IRs, academic libraries are often tasked with policy implementation and management.

Unfortunately, open access policy implementation is not an easy task (Armbruster 2011). Often, library staff solicit faculty publications, research publisher self-archiving policies, and deposit material (with accurate and robust metadata). In addition, libraries spend a significant amount of time addressing reasons faculty do not participate in publication self-archiving, including a lack of time to determine publisher self-archiving policies and deposit articles (Davis
and Connolly 2007). Because there is rarely a penalty for non-compliance, many faculty still do not participate in self-archiving activities even after passage of an institutional OA policy. (Xia et al. 2012).

Many academic libraries respond to this lack of faculty participation by harvesting faculty publications for deposit. Because there are a number of diverse activities involved, libraries incorporate various workflows for OA policy implementation. While such workflows certainly streamline the process of harvesting and depositing publications, their development and management require significant resources. Although most libraries with such workflows report as little as one FTE position needed to manage publication harvest and deposit, additional support is required to design and support in-house databases and integrate commercial tools into the existing infrastructure.

Unfortunately, libraries at smaller institutions often have limited resources to pursue such extensive activities. This is problematic because the number of smaller schools with campus-wide OA policies is growing at a fast rate. Trinity University in Texas became the first small liberal arts university to pass an OA policy (Trinity University 2009). Oberlin College in Ohio and Rollins College in Florida soon followed (Miller 2011, 16). At least ten small colleges and universities now have OA policies (University of Southampton 2012). In his 2011 article, Miller explains that OA policies may actually be more important for smaller colleges than for larger research institutions because teaching-focused schools are great consumers of information. Open access enables scholars and students to gain access to a broad range of publications at a time when smaller libraries often have limited periodical subscriptions. Miller argues that emphasizing open access encourages members of the college community to look beyond local library holdings, enriching scholarship (Miller 2011, 16-17).
Although smaller institutions may have a smaller number of faculty with smaller research output (via journal articles), much work is still required to facilitate OA policy implementation. Identifying publications for just a handful of faculty can be a time-consuming task. Tracking down faculty post-prints is difficult for institutions of any size. The additional activities required for managing OA policies can be a burden on a small library staff that already “wear a number of different hats.”

While the ultimate goal of smaller libraries may be to eventually have a robust workflow that incorporates many of the resources used by larger libraries, short-term solutions are needed to capture faculty publications. There is a need for solutions that are efficient, flexible, and can be accomplished with minimal resources. Through trial and error, the Rice University Fondren Library developed a workflow that allows one staff member to harvest and deposit all faculty publications.

Although Rice University is classified as a research university, Fondren Library has a small, lean staff, with a limited budget. Fondren staff developed the workflow after the Rice University Faculty Senate passed an Open Access Policy in 2012, directing all faculty to deposit copies of their peer-reviewed journal articles in the Rice Digital Scholarship Archive, the University’s IR. When considering workflows, Fondren staff looked to existing literature on OA policy implementation and considered existing library resources, digital project policies and procedures, and the fast-changing nature of open access issues. Taking these factors into consideration, staff determined that a combination of wikis, Zotero, spreadsheets, and Google Scholar alerts can streamline the process of identifying faculty publications and publisher self-archiving policies. Although not every publication is captured, and the workflow can certainly be
more streamlined and robust, these ongoing activities capture a significant portion of faculty scholarship at Rice University.

**Literature review**

When considering open access policy implementation workflows, Fondren staff looked to existing literature. Unfortunately, very little literature is available. Perhaps, this is due to the fact that open access policy work is new to academic libraries; not enough time has passed for libraries to refine workflows. Likewise, libraries may not share workflows because they have not yet been successful or are not well-documented. However, the literature does reveal that there are several common activities that many institutions share.

Open access policy implementation literature is relatively new. Armbruster’s 2011 article examining funder and university OA policies is considered the first to address issues related to OA policy implementation. His survey of institutions around the world reveals that many OA policies are modified throughout their lifecycle and all experience barriers to soliciting content and enforcing compliance. Despite his reference to campus OA policies, Armbruster primarily focuses on funding agency requirements and workflows. Although his discussion of issues related to soliciting content is an issue that can be applied to OA policies of all kinds, his analysis of “faculty-driven” campus-wide policies is limited (Duranceau and Kriegsman 2013, 75).

The Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) and Harvard University libraries have, thus far, contributed the most to the literature about campus-wide open access policy implementation. This is not surprising, as both schools were among the first American
institutions to adopt OA policies. In particular, Duranceau at MIT shares information about workflows through book chapters and poster presentations.

To date, Duranceau and Kriegsman’s (2013) chapter on implementing open access policies, offers the most comprehensive discussion of policy implementation. Their survey of several academic libraries at schools that were “early adopters” of OA policies reveals that there are common activities that most institutions pursue when developing a workflow. Their study supports previous claims that libraries have resorted to harvesting most faculty publications. In many cases, faculty are only contacted if a published article or post-print cannot be obtained elsewhere. Libraries either purchase, or design in-house, the infrastructure necessary for harvesting and managing publications. Some institutions use Scopus, Web of Science, or similar tools, to identify faculty publications. Others use, or are considering using, Symplectic Elements, a commercial information management system used to harvest citations from a number of online resources and campus databases (85-86).

Once faculty publications are identified, they must be managed. Publisher self-archiving policies must be researched to determine what versions of articles are allowed in an institutional repository. Some institutions use bibliographic software—often RefWorks—to “manipulate the references” obtained from harvesting activities (Duranceau and Kriesgman 2013, 85). These citations are then exported to a database or spreadsheet, where scripts are run to determine what articles are eligible for immediate deposit. Often, systems integrate the publisher self-archiving policy database SHERPA/RoMEO in the process, or pull from an in-house table of publisher policies (Willmott and Duranceau 2014). The most developed systems send automated emails to faculty, requesting post-prints for those publications that require it. Others require a bit more human interaction for post-print solicitation.
Duranceau and Kriegsman (2013) also explore staffing of OA policy workflows. Most libraries “repurpose existing staff” for work on OA policy implementation (81). Even though much of the workflow can be automated, human intervention is needed to correct errors. This is particularly important with the review of metadata. Harvested citations often have incomplete or incorrect metadata. At some libraries, technical staff participate in a well-organized review to ensure that both publication and rights metadata is complete and correct, and that authority control for institutional names and departments is applied. Other schools rely on subject librarians to reach out to faculty when post-prints are needed (Willmott and Duranceau n.d.).

It should be noted that smaller schools are already making valuable contributions to OA policy workflows. In particular, the work of library staff at the College of Wooster and Oberlin College have developed scripts to batch load metadata in an IR and to help librarians determine publisher self-archiving policies. These scripts reduced staff time required to manually deposit material (Flynn, Oyler, and Miles 2013). Such work is encouraging, as it shows that there are numerous, small-scale ways for libraries to incorporate time-saving measures into their existing and future workflows.

**Developing a workflow at a small library**

In April 2012, the Rice University Faculty Senate passed an Open Access Policy, directing faculty (tenured and tenure-track) to place copies of all peer-reviewed journal articles in the Rice Digital Scholarship Archive, the University’s institutional repository. Administered by Fondren Library, the policy applies to approximately 640 faculty in eight academic schools (Rice University 2013). An opt-out option is available for articles whose publishers do not allow posting of any version of an article to the IR (Rice University 2012).
The Rice Open Access Policy explicitly states that all activities related to the policy must be as convenient as possible for faculty (Rice University 2012). Although library staff developed easy-to-use IR submission templates and opt-out waivers, they quickly discovered that Rice faculty are no different from those at other institutions when it comes to self-archiving. Although a handful of faculty prefer to deposit material themselves, most prefer that the work is done by the library. In addition, numerous faculty remain unaware of the policy, or choose to not participate.

When it became clear that library staff would mediate most faculty publication deposits, the library looked to other academic libraries for recommended workflows. Even though much of the existing literature describes the workflows of larger libraries, it does offer general concepts and methods that can be scaled down. In order to develop Fondren’s evolving workflow, library staff considered a number of local library issues and general OA issues. The resulting activities are simple, and they can easily be modified as work with the policy reveals additional needs.

Finding a workflow that works

Library staff identified local library issues when considering adoption of workflows designed by other institutions. A workflow is only successful if it is manageable and realistic. When exploring workflow options for OA policy implementation, Fondren staff considered three important aspects: existing library resources, existing library digital project workflows, and the fast-changing nature of OA issues.

Existing Library Resources. Perhaps the most important issue to consider when developing an OA workflow is existing library resources. In addition to harvesting content, OA policy management requires a large amount of work, even when most aspects of the workflow
are automated. As evidenced in the literature review and in other literature about institutional repositories, library staff support a number of policy activities. Many academic libraries distribute such activities across many staff members. Information technology staff help with the design of in-house databases or scripts, or integrate commercial software into existing systems. Reference librarians often have established relationships with faculty and deep subject knowledge (Buehler and Boateng 2005). In addition, they are already engaged in other library outreach activities (Mullen 2011), solicit publications, research publisher self-archiving policies, and deposit material. Technical services staff may be used to address issues related to IR metadata (Willmott and Duranceau n.d.).

Unfortunately, Fondren’s size (approximately one hundred librarians and staff) limits staff involvement with the Rice Open Access Policy. Most staff are already “over-stretched,” making it difficult to add daily OA policy work. While most library staff certainly make faculty aware of the OA policy and are engaged in discussions of OA issues, one designated staff member manages day-to-day activities related to policy management. As a result, any workflow pursued must be manageable by one person. Development and integration of policy workflow databases and scripts must fall within the capabilities of this staff member.

In addition to limited staff, limited funding impacts what commercial tools are utilized for workflow management. Although the library may consider commercial options for managing policy implementation, the cost must be considered with the potential outcomes. Use of these commercial tools seems most effective when linking databases and information systems across campus and beyond. Until Fondren identifies additional partners across campus to maximize such tools, the cost is prohibitive.
Alignment with existing policies and workflows. In addition to considering existing resources, staff attempt to align all OA policy implementation work with existing library digital project workflows and policies. This helps to ensure long-term preservation and access of faculty publications. In particular, staff focus on issues related to the Rice Digital Scholarship Archive, the university’s IR. Since the repository’s development almost a decade ago, staff from Fondren’s Digital Scholarship Services and Technical Services departments and the Woodson Research Center (archives and special collections) have collaborated on a number of digital projects. Over time, staff identified and adopted best practices from the library community and incorporated them into local workflows and policies. The library attempts to align as many OA policy workflow activities with those of other library digital projects. This includes following guidelines for issues such as file formats, file naming, metadata creation, name authority control, and batch importing. This helps to ensure that, from a technical perspective, faculty publications placed in the IR are as similar as possible to other IR content.

Other Rice Digital Scholarship Archive practices also greatly influenced what parts of workflows developed at other libraries Fondren staff could incorporate locally, and, in particular, the library’s policy about IR items limits workflow replication. The literature reveals that some libraries first enter publication metadata in an IR, as it is harvested from numerous sources. The metadata is then exported to determine publisher policies, or is linked to other information systems. Library staff then add files (bitstreams) to records, contacting faculty for post-prints if needed (Flynn, Oyler, and Miles 2013). This suggests that many libraries have a number of records in their IR that do not have affiliated bitstreams. When possible, Fondren does not include any records that do not have an affiliated bitstream in an effort to emphasize the
importance of making full text scholarship openly available. This greatly affects how the library manages publisher self-archiving policies and article deposit.

**The changing nature of open access.** Library staff also attempt to ensure that any workflow is flexible to accommodate inevitable changes in OA issues. The fast-paced nature of the OA environment ensures that institutional, federal, and publisher rules about self-archiving are constantly evolving. Fondren staff are hesitant to devote too much effort to workflow development when external bodies move even faster, changing requirements for self-archiving.

In his 2011 study, Armbruster finds that funding agencies and institutions repeatedly change OA policies as a result of diverse issues, such as compliance, changing institutional priorities, and support infrastructure. Even Rice’s Open Access Policy is subject to change, as it is reviewed by the Faculty Senate every three years (Rice University 2012). In the future, Rice faculty may no longer be required to make their work available in the IR, or there may eventually be a large number of faculty who deposit work themselves. Any changes in policy or faculty self-archiving habits greatly affects workflow.

Changing publisher policies on author self-archiving also affects workflow. In response to the growing OA movement and the increase in institutional OA policies, publishers constantly change policies. The publisher policy database SHERPA/RoMEO attempts to keep up with publishers, but this proves to be a difficult task with the sheer number of publishers and differences in self-archiving policies, even among journals with the same publisher. Some publishers fully embrace open access, allowing authors to deposit the published version of their work in an IR. Others only allow deposit of post-prints, often with an embargo period.

Fondren also closely monitors developments in government OA initiatives, as they may have profound effects on workflow. In February 2013, the Office of Science and Technology
Policy (OSTP) released a memo entitled “Increasing Access to the Results of Federally Funded Scientific Research” (Holdren 2013). It directs all federal research agencies to develop and implement public access plans over the next several years. A number of models have been developed to help agencies ensure compliance. Some models, like the Shared Access Research Ecosystem (SHARE), which was developed by the Association of Research Libraries, the Association of American Universities, and the Association of Public and Land-Grant Universities, rely heavily on author participation with placement of post-prints in a network of institutional repositories (Association of Research Libraries 2013). If such an approach is adopted by funding agencies, Fondren must be prepared to modify its workflow to accommodate an increase in deposits and compliance tracking.

**The current workflow**

Fondren’s workflow for harvesting and depositing faculty publications can be described more as an ever-evolving process rather than as one “set in stone.” The evolving nature of the OA environment necessitates that the workflow adapt quickly and be flexible to respond to any changes in Rice’s OA Policy or an increase in faculty member participation. The workflow must also be responsive to changes within the library, whether it be staffing or resource allotment.

Because only one Fondren staff member manages the day-to-day activities related to the OA Policy, it is very easy to quickly change the workflow. Unfortunately, shortly after the passage of Rice’s OA Policy, this also led to an uncoordinated approach to mediated deposit of faculty publications. Initially, staff just wanted to get as much content as possible in the Rice Digital Scholarship Archive to encourage faculty participation. Library staff discovered faculty publications in a number of ways, including departmental and lab websites. They then identified
publisher self-archiving policies using SHERPA/RoMEO and publisher websites, and occasionally contacted faculty with post-print requests, if needed. Staff manually deposited each article in the IR, with varying formatting of data input. Although this was, at times, tedious, a significant portion of faculty scholarship has been captured.

Despite successfully adding to the IR, this first “workflow” was not ideal. With no method for regulating publication harvesting or tracking what publications were cleared for deposit in the IR, coverage was “spotty.” Often, the work was so sporadic that certain departments received more attention than others, or staff forgot to send post-print solicitations, notify authors that OA publications were made available, or follow-up with faculty who provided work for deposit. Since staff manually deposited each article, there was inconsistency in the application of metadata. Although library staff developed metadata guidelines for faculty publications, the time required to submit each item, and the inability to compare with other records before making publicly available, resulted in missing or incorrect metadata and virtually no quality control.

Because such activities were so varied and inconsistent, they were not well-documented. If Fondren decided to assign additional staff or student workers to daily OA policy work, it would be difficult to share information. There was no way to tell what approaches had been tried and which ones worked.

In an attempt to better standardize work and ensure some form of quality control, staff modified activities to create a more efficient, defined workflow. A major component of this new approach is the documentation of all activities. Even though all of Fondren’s activities related to the OA policy are simple and require minimal description, documentation provides for improved workflow analysis. Documentation also helps library staff better identify what parts of the
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Workflow do and do not work. In fact, the workflow was modified during the writing of this article as a result of an assessment of the documentation (or lack thereof).

A wiki is used as the primary tool to share information and track changes to the workflow. The wiki is part of a larger Fondren Digital Projects wiki, which allows staff to align the OA policy workflow with established best practices in library digital projects, such as guidelines for metadata creation, file naming, and batch importing. Wiki documentation related to Rice’s Open Access Policy and other digital library projects can be found at http://bit.ly/1hhdujL.

The workflow that is currently in place at Fondren can be divided into three distinct phases: Discover, Manage, Deposit (“fig. 1”). Article deposit involves using several methods to identify faculty publications. Article management describes the process of harvesting citations, researching publisher green archiving policies, and contacting authors. Article deposit involves batch importing metadata and files to the IR and providing author follow-up services. The workflow makes use of a number of free resources, including Google Scholar and Zotero, thereby providing a workflow model that requires no additional cost to the library.

Discover

Identify publications. Since passage of Rice’s Open Access Policy, Fondren has explored numerous methods of identifying and harvesting faculty publications, opting for low-cost methods that allow for ongoing harvesting rather than occasional batch pulls. This allows for work to be divided into manageable daily activities rather than large projects that require staff to halt normal work for large periods of time. It should be noted that although most of the publications deposited in the Rice Digital Scholarship Archive are harvested from online
resources, some are still obtained from contact with individual faculty members. Through
departmental presentations and individual email solicitations, faculty provide curriculum vitae to
library staff for review. Applicable publications are obtained and processed in the same manner
as harvested publications.

Staff identified Google Scholar as a free tool to identify faculty publications. Google
serves as a tool to supplement harvesting of publications from resources such as campus news,
Research Gate, Academia.edu, faculty and laboratory websites, PubMed Central, and faculty
self-reporting. In Google Scholar, one can set up alerts for individual authors. Staff obtained lists
of faculty from departmental websites and university administration and set up Google Scholar
alerts for every tenured and tenure-track faculty member. Because Google limits the number of
alerts for each account, several accounts are used to manage all faculty. Spreadsheets track what
faculty are linked to each Google account; the information is reviewed annually to add or delete
faculty, as needed. Google sends alerts several times a week to each account. Of Rice’s
approximately 640 faculty, only a small percentage publish frequently in scholarly journals.
Thus, there are no more than several hundred alerts weekly; of those, perhaps only about a
quarter are for Rice faculty publications.

Although staff still have to check each alert manually to see if the author is, indeed, a
Rice faculty member, the process is relatively fast and easy. The advantage of using Google to
identify faculty publications is that it is an ongoing process. Rather than deal with potentially
hundreds of publications once or twice a year, the process involves only a handful each week. In
addition, since the Google alerts are in email form and are sent to designated email accounts,
library staff can work through the alerts at their leisure. Staff can spend just a few minutes each
day sorting through the alerts, freeing up time for other activities.
Manage

Harvest citations. Fondren staff use the free bibliographic software Zotero to capture citations for faculty publications, regardless of how they are discovered. Regularly, data from the Zotero files is exported to the Excel spreadsheet that tracks faculty publication requests and deposits. Once the data is exported, it is removed from Zotero to ensure that there is no duplication. The spreadsheet tracks the remainder of the process of requesting publications and depositing files. This spreadsheet serves as the primary tool for tracking the workflow. Information recorded includes:

- Author name, department, and email.
- Article citation.
- Indication that it is an OA publication.
- Embargo period, if required.
- Date post-print requested or author notified that OA publication will be made available.
- Date author responded to request.
- Indication that a waiver was requested.
- Date publication deposited in IR.
- Was the author provided the handle (permanent URL)?
- Article DOI (to prevent duplicate deposits).
- File name (for deposit).
- Additional notes.

The above information is provided for all publications discovered, even if they are ultimately not deposited in the IR. New spreadsheets are created every semester to reduce the amount of data in each.

Research Publisher Green Archiving Policy. As many articles as possible are placed in the Rice Digital Scholarship Archive. For each article, staff identify publisher green (self-archiving) policies, using the database Sherpa/RoMEO as the primary resource. Fondren staff also created a wiki page to track publisher policies not found in Sherpa/RoMEO.
**Notify author.** On an ongoing basis, staff notify authors to request post-prints or notify them that their OA publications will be made available in the IR unless the author objects. An email template is used for each type of request. Both include language that emphasizes the benefits of depositing publications in the Rice Digital Scholarship Archive and directs the reader to additional resources about Rice’s OA Policy. The spreadsheet is used to track when authors respond. Unfortunately, many authors never respond to post-print requests. However, it is important to track such requests and the lack of response to provide a statistical analysis of OA Policy-related activities.

Files provided by authors or discovered online by library staff are stored on a secure, shared drive until deposit. Consistent file naming helps future IR preservation efforts. Library staff follow file-naming guidelines developed for all Fondren digital projects. When an article is obtained electronically, the file name remains unchanged. Staff generate a file name (through a standardized process) only if they helped to create a digital version.

**Deposit**

**Deposit article(s).** When depositing faculty publications in the Rice Digital Scholarship Archive, all metadata is batch-imported using a spreadsheet. Since most faculty publications are deposited by library staff, this process helps to ensure consistent metadata and facilitates quality control. Library staff use the same metadata guidelines provided to faculty and staff who prefer to deposit material themselves; this ensures some consistency in completeness of records. A template is used to format the spreadsheet in a way that allows the IR—the Rice Digital Scholarship Archive uses DSpace—to seamlessly upload metadata. The spreadsheet is formatted to use the same Dublin Core fields as those found in DSpace, such as dc.title,
dc.contributor.author, and dc.subject.keyword. The spreadsheet also allows the user to automatically map publications to several collections at the same time—a useful tool because most articles are found in three or more collections.

Once staff check that the metadata is accurate, the spreadsheet is saved as a CSV file and opened in OpenOffice, where it undergoes further editing. The metadata is reviewed one more time before the CSV file is batch imported into DSpace. Once the metadata is batch-imported, staff add the associated file(s) (bitstreams) and check that the required embargo period is honored, if necessary.

*Author follow-up.* Once articles are deposited in the IR, library staff use an email template to provide the author the handle (permanent URL) for each record. In addition to the handle, the message encourages the author to deposit additional material in the Rice Digital Scholarship Archive.

**Looking ahead**

Fondren Library’s current open access policy implementation workflow is certainly not perfect. This is one of the realities that all academic libraries—large and small—must accept. Even with the best planning, implementation strategies often fail; the complex nature of OA policies necessitates constant workflow revision (Armbruster 2011).

Because constant revision is needed, Fondren staff constantly review the workflow for improvement. Depending on the nature of funder, university, and publisher OA policies, and available library resources, the workflow will certainly change, and it will, hopefully, become more robust. Many aspects of the workflow should be more efficient and streamlined. When
considering future workflows, Fondren will benefit from considering solutions at both the library level and institutional level.

Within the library, staff are exploring commercial and free reference management software options. The library currently uses Zotero which, although great for capturing references, does not easily export XML data. A solution that better manages XML would enable library staff to make full use of some of the useful tools designed by librarians, including the SHERPA/RoMEO script designed by library staff at the College of Wooster (Flynn, Oyler, and Miles 2013). Easier XML conversion (or conversion to other interoperable formats) will also enable easier population of spreadsheets for batch importing and sharing of data between various information systems on campus.

One of the “selling points” for faculty use of the Rice Digital Scholarship Archive is that there is a possibility for publication data to be shared among numerous information systems on campus. Ideally, faculty would be able to enter publication information (or the metadata is harvested from a number of online sources) in one campus system, which then pushes to all others (i.e., grants management and faculty reporting systems). Such campus-wide networks may benefit from the use of commercial information management systems. In order to justify the expense of such systems, the library must continue to develop relationships across campus to explore ways of sharing information and reducing faculty and staff time and effort in reporting activities. Campus-wide collaborations may also help with issues regarding name authority control in the faculty publication collections in Rice’s IR. Tools such as ORCID can help the library ensure that publications harvested from various online resources are actually authored by Rice faculty. It is hoped that new federal public access initiatives will encourage campus-wide collaboration.
Conclusion

Although Fondren’s current workflow for open access policy implementation is not as robust or comprehensive as those at larger universities, it is “good enough.” The combination of wikis, Zotero, spreadsheets, and Google Scholar alerts streamline the process of identifying faculty publications and publisher self-archiving policies, while reducing faculty effort for policy compliance. Although not every publication is captured, these ongoing activities ensure that a significant portion of faculty scholarship is made publicly available in the IR.

As more faculty begin to comply with the Rice Open Access Policy, it will probably be necessary to reassess this simple workflow and adopt a more robust system of publication harvest and deposit. In the meantime, the existing workflow serves a purpose to populate the IR so that faculty can see the benefits of policy compliance. Most importantly, the workflow frees up time for much-needed OA policy outreach and awareness activities.

Fondren’s experience can demonstrate to smaller libraries that managing open access policy activities can be conducted with minimal resources. The existing literature on OA policy implementation is a valuable resource for identifying basic workflow structure and common barriers to policy implementation. However, each library must develop its own unique workflow that accommodates institutional culture and available resources. Libraries must also be prepared for failure and the need for ongoing workflow revision.

Although working with OA policies can be a daunting task for libraries of any size, there are great benefits for library participation. In addition to providing service to the institution, library engagement with OA policies furthers free access to information around the world. The open access movement is large and takes on various forms. Although OA policies are only a
small piece of the OA puzzle, they can make a profound difference in the effort of expanding access to information for people around the world.
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