Once the repository platform has been selected, and the practitioners have made the policy-setting decisions, the next stage is populating the repository with content. As the notion of institutional repositories has expanded, so have the numerous types of content and the strategies and initiatives employed to add them. From the recognized versions of previously published scholarship and multiple forms of gray literature, to the emerging array of repository-based publishing outputs, there are many forms repository content can take, as well as the means to acquire them. The authors in Part 3 examine the different mindsets, rationales, strategies, and initiatives that work best with the various types of potential repository materials that could be deposited, as well as the development of emerging and diverse library publishing programs focused on the creation of new content.

Davis-Kahl begins by discussing the traditional model for content within an institutional repository, previously published scholarship in the form of green open access, specifically on both the engagement and resistance by faculty to self-archiving their scholarship in the repository. Davis-Kahl tries to answer the questions surrounding the themes and patterns to discussing green archiving with faculty, the differences between the disciplines, and what may be the future for self-archiving practices and the general adoption of open access. Davis-Kahl argues that librarians cannot depend on a one-size-fits-all approach toward faculty when conducting their repository outreach and engagement. While faculty perceptions will not be changed in the short term, librarians must make the long-term commitment to raise
awareness of the IR, increasing faculty knowledge of their author rights, and to understand and respond to the individual priorities and concerns of the faculty. This way, librarians will possess a better understanding of individual behaviors of their faculty, and also the social constructs within which they operate that may form their individual behaviors.

While Davis-Kahl mentions the strategies for addressing green archiving principles with faculty, Scherer elaborates by presenting the need for a diverse marketing and outreach programs, as well as repository-based services, resources, and opportunities that are focused toward content creators and users. Scherer focuses on what is needed to make an IR more appealing, and what incentives are necessary to increase acceptance and deposits. He further argues that one has to identify the key internal and external stakeholders so that one can better understand the information, capabilities, and services that will create the incentives for participation and deposit. Beyond developing a marketing plan, repositories will need a developed infrastructure of related services, which may include copyright, deposit assistance, metrics and measurement services, and content development.

While green open access has been the standard strategy for content for institutional repositories, there has been an emerging trend in developing publications and other forms of scholarly communication content through library publishing programs. Although there are those who believe the function of a repository should be separate from active publishing, Sacchi and Newton draw together the connections and shared components of both. Sacchi and Newton present the correlations between institutional repositories and scholarly publishing programs for journal-like publications and, as these two programs begin to shift and share additional components, make clear that there are several conclusions that can be drawn about the appropriateness of these two programs merging. Sacchi and Newton’s argument is closely built on their own case study of Columbia’s Center for Digital Research and Scholarship (CDRS). With more institutions adopting integrated models and cross-institutional relationships being further developed to foster publishing expertise, Sacchi and Newton argue that the current barriers to introducing significant change into the scholarly communication ecosystem become less problematic.
Beyond merging parallel programs and initiatives as a means to introduce significant change, there are other useful benefits of combining institutional repository and library publishing initiatives. As a mechanism for teaching and learning, these interwoven initiatives provide an excellent opportunity for librarians to provide hands-on instructional experiences and learning opportunities to students. Mitchell and Schiff offer an outline for moving beyond the traditional role of a repository to one that becomes the platform for transformative publishing practices and educational opportunities. Mitchell and Schiff explore the role of the repository as both a pedagogical prompt and a necessary piece of the training of future scholarly journal editors. While working with close collaborators at both their home and affiliated institutions allows a starting point for a pedagogical experience as Schiff and Mitchell discuss, it also presents an opportunity for librarians to better understand the variations of the needs and values among the academic disciplines they work with. By attending to the specific disciplinary-based needs, the library publishing program can provide a more dynamic set of benefits and solutions for the entire community it serves.

In Part 3 we see that there are many traditional and emerging mechanisms and programs to build repository collections. We also see how marketing to the creators of the content can be used as a means to further educate constituents on open access and other scholarly communication topics and practices. Each chapter begins with a conversation about past practices and lessons learned from previous scholars and practices. We then see how those past practices and lessons formed the models and initiatives created to address the multiple avenues practitioners may take to populate the repository, while also offering strategies to educate constituents on the value of the content deposited to or created through the repository and possible publishing programs.