

Shared Content Leadership Group

Meeting Minutes, May 26, 2016

Attendees present: Martha Hruska (SD, chair), Jean McKenzie (B), Gail Yokote (D), John Renaud (I), Sharon Farb (LA), Jim Dooley (M), Allison Scott (R), Julia Kochi (SF), Eunice Schroeder (SB), Kerry Scott (SC), Ivy Anderson (CDL).

Absent: Becky Imamoto (LAUC), Wendy Parfrey (CDL)

OA 2020: Discussion Document for SCLG Discussion, 2016-05-20 DRAFT

OA2020 Initiative: <http://oa2020.org/>

Status as of 5/20/16: 49 signatories to date; mostly from Europe, but also including S. Korea, Turkey, Chile. Assorted major supporters: European University Association, JISC, German Research Foundation, Austrian Science Fund, Dutch UKB Consortium, World Meteorological Organization, European Geosciences Union.

The argument behind OA2020:

1. Despite the emergence of many new forms of OA, most journals still use the subscription model, with its many deficiencies in terms of access, re-use rights, and cost.
2. The persistence of these journals reflects the choices and preferences of our authors – despite the availability of green and gold alternatives, publishing in the existing subscription journals continues to flourish, as authors continue to publish in them.
3. Large scale transformation will not happen by relying solely on the launch of new OA journals or green OA to facilitate change, because authors are not adopting those practices in large enough numbers. In order to accelerate the move to OA and thus overcome the deficiencies of the subscription system, a concerted effort to convert the existing journals to open access is needed.
4. In order for this transformation to happen, libraries should consciously and purposefully redirect their subscription expenditures in such a way that those funds are used to support open access in those journals.
5. This can only be successful if a worldwide consensus can be developed wherein libraries and other financial stakeholders (such as governments and funders) all work toward this goal and adopt specific processes and policies to make that happen, thus taking control of the process and putting pressure on existing publishers to transform their business models. Without a collective effort, publishers will control gold OA developments, which will continue to be haphazard and plagued with problems such as double-dipping and rampant costs.

6. Such a large scale transformation can and should be accomplished without putting new money into the journal publishing system – in fact, OA should be cheaper than the subscription system on a global level.
7. Transformation should be conducted in accordance with community preferences – some author communities may be more prepared to or interested in moving in this direction than others. Efforts should be concentrated in fields in which this direction is supported by the scholarly community.
8. This movement is compatible with and complementary to developments that encourage new publishing models and new forms of OA to develop and flourish; libraries can and should consciously support both of these strategies as part of a broader and more profound transformation of scholarly publishing practices.

Questions for Discussion:

1. Which of these statements do we agree with? Which don't we agree with?
2. What facts about/issues regarding research libraries' collections does OA 2020 not take into account, and what negative impacts might any potential action we might take on OA 2020 have on those issues, our activities, and roles?
3. Is OA2020 likely to increase the market power of the large commercial publishers?
4. What other negative impacts, consequences, and risks might this have?
5. How can the voices of the producers of published scholarship be brought into this discussion?
6. Is there further investigation that would help us evaluate the pros and cons?

Minutes of Meeting - Scholarly Communications Action Strategy

What happens if system wide licensing is flipped to Gold OA? We need a philosophy.

Are we in alignment to use collection budgets towards furthering OA?

CoUL will be discussing at their June meeting.

These statements really only address journals, but they are only a portion of the scholarly communications universe. What are other implications that aren't reflected in these questions if we're discussing something other than journals?

Subliminal message in OA2020 message is that libraries have the ability to change author behavior, depending if they want to.

Moving through the document:

1. Statement of fact. Question is what is the problem with the subscription model? Is it about access barriers, cost, privatization, etc.? Subscription journals are still a huge issue even though we've been pushing for OA for years. Is it the model or is it the fact that publishers' models are profit maximizing. Is it just a problem of cost or is it the privatization of information in an ethical economy (that says info should be accessible)?
2. Statement of fact. Question is our authors could make different choices. Should our focus of energy be trying to influence their choices? #7 might be a strategy in addressing #2.
3. Basically saying that Green OA won't get us there (or new OA journals). In the short term it probably will cause more. May mean that the money will go towards the current commercial infrastructure. Anything that won't work with authors is a waste of a lot of time and energy. Also issue is way academy values publication through promotion and tenure. What is the end goal we're trying to reach? Is it that the information should be "free" (i.e. available) or that we want to save money or that we don't want the publishers to be making a large profit? For OA2020, the core goal is information is freely available at not a different cost. However fair would be defined, is that should be a "fair" APC market. If we convert community budget to fund APCs for individual publications that would be death to libraries.

Reframe: large scale transformation won't happen with the way we're going. If we want to accelerate it, we have to consciously and concertedly make it happen in a more focused and intentional way. Hruska would challenge that fast, large scale transformation is a goal we want to happen (because it should be driven by what communities want).

Do we think there are author communities that want to keep that subscription model? Don't think most authors care. Many societies rely on publication revenues that allow them to do other things. What could libraries do to work with communities that are already outside the subscription community - SSRN, ArXiv, etc. They are submitting the papers to the open repositories but still submitting them to journals. Library perspective is that access is the main issue; faculty perspective is promotion/tenure and validation. Faculty are sympathetic that something costs too much, but faculty won't change their behavior of using journals for credentialing.

For the most part, there are reservations about blanket OA2020 statement both from "personal" and "UL" position - but much still to discuss and research.