

Scholarly Communication Update for SLASIAC

Sept. 30, 2011

The responses to the second strategy of the LPTF Interim Report (Strategies that Address the Pricing of Academic Publications) suggest that more communication is needed between the libraries and the faculty around issues of the scholarly communication system.

The UCOLASC response letter said that a “cogent argument” should be made to scholars about why retention of copyright is an important issue, and that faculty need to understand how their individual choices impact the system of scholarly communication. One comment was that faculty cannot be expected to “decline to publish in certain journals or to insist on retaining copyrights” until institutional support is in place. While the libraries can only do so much to influence the tenure and review process that seems to impede progress in this area, the University of California can – and does – provide support in the form of educational materials and resources that help scholars navigate the complex scholarly communication landscape.

The following material is intended to provide a snapshot of current issues in the scholarly communication community. It starts with selected UC initiatives and then describes actions that others are taking.

I. UC’s initiatives

The University of California libraries are engaged in a wide variety of scholarly communication programs, projects and initiatives. These efforts happen on the campuses, as system-wide collaborations, and in partnership with other institutions.

eScholarship and the CDL’s Publishing Group

The Publishing Group provides open access digital publication services to the University of California academic community, supporting UC scholars and research units seeking unfettered digital distribution of their research outputs in both traditional and non-traditional forms. The Publishing Group’s transformative tools and platforms are designed to support new modes of scholarly communication and new communities of authors and readers.

The publishing and dissemination infrastructure includes:

- Assurance of peer review and authority within open access publishing
- Low cost publishing tools, for both well-established and emerging, grant-poor disciplines
- Branded publication management, for academic units, labs, Organized Research Units (ORUs) and Multi-campus Research Units (MRUs)
- Compliance with funding agency and federal mandates for access and preservation
- Integrated access for publications that include data sets and other supplemental files
- Support for the dissemination of UC student research, both graduate and undergraduate
- Guaranteed persistent access

Selected eScholarship facts & figures:

- Average annual cost per article: \$8.99
- More than 43,000 publications (articles, working papers, conference proceedings)
- 40 open access journals

- 280 UC departments and research units participating
- More than 13 million publication views since 2002

Providing open access publishing services supports the stated desires of UC faculty, on behalf of whom the UC Academic Senate has petitioned the University to work to advance open access initiatives.

Scholarly Communication Education & Information around UC

Campuses have developed materials to use in informing students and faculty about issues surrounding copyright, intellectual property, and scholarly communication. The Scholarly Communication Officer's group (<http://libraries.universityofcalifornia.edu/sco/>) is composed of librarians from each campus who work on scholarly communication issues locally, and contribute to systemwide planning of initiatives and programs such as the Reshaping Scholarly Communication website (osc.universityofcalifornia.edu), which provides facts, news, and in-depth information for faculty and scholars on how their actions can impact the scholarly communication system.

Topics covered on the Reshaping Scholarly Communication website include why authors should consider retaining their copyright to their works, how authors should manage the rights they assign to publishers, and what options authors have in negotiating contracts with potential publishers. Authors can find templates for changing the wording of publication agreements and sample addenda to allow more freedom for scholars' use of their own work. The site covers alternative forms of publishing such as open access journals and platforms such as institutional repositories. For those who are interested, the website also offers suggestions for faculty on how to further influence the system of scholarly communication by wielding influence with societies and publishers.

Open Access Funding

UC Berkeley, along with a dozen other universities in the US and Canada, has signed onto a "compact for open access publishing equity." (More information at: <http://www.oacompact.org/>) These universities have pledged to develop "durable mechanisms for underwriting reasonable publication charges for articles written by faculty in fee-based open access journals." In other words, make article processing charges levied by some open access publications available to qualifying authors. The director of Harvard University's Office for Scholarly Communication, Stuart Schieber, thinks of Harvard's fund as a safety net to be used only when there is no other funding available. Schieber noted that the overall cost to a University would be quite small.

Established in 2008, UC Berkeley's Berkeley Research Impact Initiative (BRII) serves faculty, post-docs and graduate students who have no other available funding (such as grants) to pay author publication fees. BRII has reimbursed authors for 75 articles in 38 unique journals.

Strategic Journal Negotiations

Due to reductions in library materials budgets, the Council of University Librarians established a target budgetary reduction of 15% per year. This has been achieved since 2009 by negotiation with publishers and, unfortunately, cancellations of some journal licenses.

In 2011, CDL was confronted with the renewal of one of its largest publisher agreements: the systemwide journals license with Springer Science +Business Media. CDL's analysis of the Springer portfolio revealed an overall cost per use that was higher than the norm for other CDL packages, with many individual titles whose value characteristics warranted review. As the 2011 renewal approached, CDL initiated negotiations with Springer with a goal of reducing the base cost of the Libraries' systemwide license.

After a lengthy negotiation, in March 2011, CDL and Springer reached agreement on a new two-year license that will allow the UC libraries to reduce the cost of the journals contract but will require the cancellation of 376 Springer journals previously licensed at UC. Access to pre-cancellation content for the 376 titles will vary according to the level of perpetual rights that UC holds for particular titles. UC libraries will retain complete backfile access to 146 of these journals (from earliest years through 2010).

In 2011, the UC libraries also cancelled the Informa Healthcare (IHC) journals consortial license. IHC was targeted for cancellation because CDL's weighted value algorithm showed it to have less value compared to other health sciences titles across the system. In addition, IHC intended to implement a new "multi-site fee" for the UC system that would have resulted in a 50% increase to UC's cost in 2011. Previously licensed IHC content will still be available, and a small number of titles will be licensed by individual campuses in 2011. In order to monitor the impact of this cancellation decision within the UC community, CDL will review 2011 IHC interlibrary loan transactions and will collect and analyze comments received by campus libraries.

Regarding *Nature Publishing Group* negotiations, the libraries are still engaged in collaborative discussions with NPG that have focused on transformative ideas.

More information on systemwide library license reductions is available on the CDL website: <http://www.cdlib.org/services/collections/current/publicbudgetletter2011.html>

II. The Scholarly Communication Landscape – Beyond UC

Current events in the world of Scholarly Communication include the announcement that three respected science organizations are launching their own open access journal, a declaration by the Research Libraries UK group that members will not sign large deals with two of the biggest academic journal publishers until they see significant cost reductions, JSTOR freely displaying its backfiles of public domain journal content, PLoS achieving financial stability seven years after launching, and more.

Three broad themes in scholarly communication in 2011 emerge from numerous articles, blog posts, interviews and discussions:

- The economics of the system are broken; the challenge of economic sustainability.

- Ways in which the migration to digital format is substantially transforming the modes of transmission and the needs of producers and consumers (e.g. faster production, provision of supplemental material, increased amount of data).
- Uncertainty about the roles and financial responsibility of various stakeholders, including scholars, publishers, libraries, and research funders.

Open Access and Cost – Who should pay?

With more publishers developing open access and “hybrid OA” models that require institutional subscriptions and/or “article processing charges” (APC) to make their content open, the opportunity for sharing journal costs among stakeholders becomes increasingly possible. While libraries currently pay for journal licenses, authors and grant funders are legitimate alternatives. Some authors are able to pay the APC out of their research grants, while others without funding can turn to the institutional funds that may be available (see “Open Access Funding” above). Average article processing charges range from \$1,200 to \$3,000.

In 2005, Wellcome Trust, the UK’s biggest non-governmental funder of biomedical research, proposed that “dissemination costs are research costs” and pledged to cover the costs for grantees wanting to publish in open access journals. It also mandated that articles from its funded research be deposited into PubMed Central or UK PubMed Central within 6 months of publication. In 2010, the Trust spent \$4.9million in open access publishing fees. The Trust projects that when open access publishing becomes the norm, it will spend \$12million per year in APCs, still only 1.25% of its current research budget.

(Source: <http://poynder.blogspot.com/2011/08/open-access-interviews-wellcome-trusts.html>)

Open Access Sustainability and PLoS

In 2010, seven years after entering the publishing business, the Public Library of Science (PLOS) attained financial stability by covering its operating costs with revenue. This is significant because it offers a positive response to the question of whether open access is a sustainable publishing model. PLoS ONE, the PLoS flagship, is a “mega-journal” publishing 12,000 papers per year. Several academic publishers have recently announced similar types of open access ventures, including the American Institute of Physics (AIP Advances), Nature Publishing Group (Scientific Reports), the Company of Biologists (Biology Open) and Sage (Sage Open). Almost all journal publishers are now offering Hybrid OA models, where authors can pay an article processing charge to have their articles made freely available on the web even when published in a traditional subscription publication.

New Open Access Science Journal with a UC Editor

Randy W. Schekman, a distinguished cell biologist at UC Berkeley and the 14th editor of the *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, has been named the first editor of a new open access journal that the Howard Hughes Medical Institute, the Max Planck Society, and the Wellcome Trust intend to launch next year. The fundamental goals of the journal, outlined by the three founding organizations are: publication of highly significant research (e.g., meant to compete with the most prestigious science journals); an independent editorial team comprised of active, practicing scientists; and a rapid and transparent peer review. The biomedical and life

sciences research journal will utilize Creative Commons licenses to ensure that the data can be shared. The three organizations have made a commitment to cover costs of launching the journal, which will subsequently be funded in part by author fees.

(Sources: <http://www.hhmi.org/news/schekman20110711.html> and <http://www.hhmi.org/news/20110627.html>)

RLUK and the Big Deal Debate

In Britain, Research Libraries UK (RLUK) announced that its members would not sign any more large deals with two of the biggest journal publishers, Elsevier and Wiley, unless these publishers agreed to significant reductions in the cost of the deals. The Association, which has lost buying power due to the loss in value of the British Pound, would like to see a 15% reduction in the cost of their “big deal” bundles of journals from Elsevier and Wiley. If it cannot come to an arrangement for bundles, the Association is prepared to purchase subscriptions on a title-by-title basis.

The top three academic journal publishers, with over 50% of the market, earn high profits:

- Elsevier (25% of academic publishing market): 36% profit in 2010.
- Springer (10% of the academic publishing market): Estimated at 38% in 2008 (latest data available)
- Wiley Academic Publishing: 41% profit in 2010.

(Sources: <http://blog.dshr.org/2011/09/whats-wrong-with-research-communication.html>, <http://chronicle.com/blogs/wiredcampus/british-research-libraries-say-no-to-big-deal-serials-packages/32371>, and <http://www.infotoday.com/it/sep11/The-Big-Deal-Not-Price-But-Cost.shtml>)

Coalition of Open Access Policy Institutions (COAPI)

At least 22 universities, including Columbia, Duke, Emory, Harvard, Kansas, MIT, and Stanford, have established the Coalition of Open Access Policy Institutions (COAPI). These institutions have all enacted faculty open access policies for scholarly research published in peer-reviewed journals. The group will “collaborate and share implementation strategies, and advocate on a national level for institutions with open access policies.” (KU Press Release, Aug. 3, 2011) The members will meet face to face for the first time in early November.

JSTOR opens Early Journal Content

On September 6, 2011, JSTOR announced that it is making journal content published prior to 1923 in the United States and prior to 1870 elsewhere freely available to anyone, anywhere in the world. This “Early Journal Content” includes discourse and scholarship in the arts and humanities, economics and politics, and in mathematics and other sciences. It includes nearly 500,000 articles from more than 200 journals. This represents 6% of the content on JSTOR.

(Source: <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>)