

JISC International Colloquium about Scholarly Communications and Publishing - London 2005: Highlights

Prepared by Rightscom Ltd

Carol Tenopir

The role of publishing in the
research process

Carol Tenopir

The role of publishing in the research process

- ▶ Data from ~30,000 scientists, engineers, physicians, and social scientists
- ▶ Publications are an important part of a complex mix of communications
- ▶ Articles are important at all stages of the research process
 - ▶ They are the main end result of the research process
 - ▶ For others, they are the beginning of the research process
- ▶ Usage (amount and type) varies considerably across specialties
- ▶ Number of full text sources growing
- ▶ Number of articles read is rising steadily
- ▶ 55% of all journals online; 83% of STM
- ▶ 1,600 Open Access journals

Carol Tenopir

The role of publishing in the research process

- ▶ Reading Varies by Subject Discipline and Workplace
 - ▶ Engineers read 111 articles/year
 - ▶ University medical researchers 322 articles/year
 - ▶ Convenience is a major factor

Carol Tenopir

The role of publishing in the research process

- ▶ Value doesn't necessarily equal frequency
 - ▶ 1/2 to 2/3 of readings are in the first year of publication, but older articles are rated as having higher value to purpose
 - ▶ Average time spent on an article by medical faculty is low (20 minutes) and most reading is for current awareness, but the few read for research take more time and are rated much more highly

Carol Tenopir

The role of publishing in the research process

- ▶ Subject experts want
 - ▶ More sources
 - ▶ More backfiles
 - ▶ Sources continue to be available
 - ▶ High quality
 - ▶ Speedy access
 - ▶ No barriers to access
 - ▶ Convenience (getting their work done)

Carol Tenopir

The role of publishing in the research process

- ▶ Convenience varies...
 - ▶ Astronomers prefer desktop e-access
 - ▶ Pediatricians prefer print on the run for journals, PDAs for drug info
 - ▶ Researchers sometimes want links to full data, medical practitioners want summarized information

Carol Tenopir

The role of publishing in the research process

- ▶ All readers need to have:
 - ▶ Confidence in quality of information (judged by journal title, authors, author affiliation, source, other)
 - ▶ Ability to find similar materials (search and browse)
 - ▶ Confidence in longevity of source
 - ▶ Convenient and timely access

Hugh Look

The UK Perspective: JISC Business Models

Hugh Look

The UK Perspective: JISC Business Models

- ▶ Analyse strengths & weaknesses of business models
- ▶ Identify “new” models that might solve some problems
- ▶ Analysis of what needs to be done to reconcile user & publisher needs
- ▶ Significant leverage from modelling tools already developed
- ▶ 7 models developed

Hugh Look

The UK Perspective: JISC Business Models

- ▶ The models
 - ▶ National licence
 - ▶ PPV converting to subscription
 - ▶ PPV pre-purchase
 - ▶ Core + peripheral
 - ▶ Open access - author pays
 - ▶ Open access - hybrid
 - ▶ Sponsored content

Hugh Look

The UK Perspective: JISC Business Models

- ▶ Most popular models for trial
 - ▶ Core + peripheral
 - ▶ PPV converting to subscription
 - ▶ National licence

Hugh Look

The UK Perspective: JISC Business Models

- ▶ No business model will reconcile library needs to control costs with publishers' needs to maintain or increase revenues
- ▶ Changed commercial business models do help find a middle ground
- ▶ Models that encourage usage generally popular with publishers & librarians
- ▶ Transitions rather than solutions?
- ▶ Author-pays open access remains unproven

Bo-Christer Björk

Open Access – some
reflections from a
Northern perspective

Bo-Christer Björk

Open Access – some reflections from a Northern perspective

- ▶ Free material is accessed more often than paid-for material
- ▶ Paid-for material is more frequently accessed on paper

Bo-Christer Björk

Open Access – some reflections from a Northern perspective

- ▶ Barriers to OA proliferation
 - ▶ Journals
 - > Business models
 - > Institutional behaviour
 - > Awareness & critical mass
 - ▶ Subject repositories
 - > Barriers not as high as for journals
 - > IT infrastructure
 - > Business models
 - > Institutional behaviour
 - > Awareness & critical mass
 - ▶ Institutional repositories (IRs)
 - > Standards
 - > Awareness & critical mass

Bo-Christer Björk

Open Access – some reflections from a Northern perspective

- ▶ Publication part of a much wider context of scientific communication
 - ▶ Multiple routes to making electronic versions available
- ▶ High level ministry work group appointed in September 2004 by the Finnish Minister of Education
 - ▶ Both OA journals and posting in OA repositories recommended
 - ▶ No absolute mandating, only recommendations
 - ▶ Recommends that the Academy and the universities collectively sign the Berlin declaration
 - ▶ Costs for author charges to OA-journals will be allowable costs
 - ▶ Funding is likely to be made available for setting up IRs and for converting scientific Journals to OA

Bo-Christer Björk

Open Access – some reflections from a Northern perspective

- ▶ **Current global situation of Open Access**
 - ▶ Most stakeholders agree that global OA would be beneficial
 - ▶ Nevertheless it is very difficult to get momentum in the shift from toll-access to OA
 - ▶ Universities have a budget restriction of their current acquisition budgets for serials
 - ▶ If the sum of author charges and subscriptions for a particular publisher stays within this budget they could be willing to go over to open access

Bo-Christer Björk

Open Access – some reflections from a Northern perspective

- ▶ A possible solution: “Institutional open choice”
 - ▶ The academic sector (including public research organisations) transform their subscription budgets for a particular publisher to institutional membership in their open choice schemes
 - ▶ This will probably account for 70%-80% of the current subscription income
 - ▶ Combined with the potential savings this should be a possible equation for the publisher

Abel L Packer

The South American
landscape and state funded
model

Abel L Packer

The South American landscape and state funded model

- ▶ SciELO's objective is to contribute to the development of science and of scientific communication in Latin America
- ▶ Brazil has a portal to 9,055 journals and 90 indexes, available to 152 institutions
 - ▶ This access costs \$29 million/year.
 - ▶ How can this be sustained?
- ▶ Locally published Latin American journals are moving to Open Access, funded from various sources, mainly science research councils or foundations – via publishing societies
 - ▶ Patterns of funding varying between countries and between subjects

Abel L Packer

The South American landscape and state funded model

- ▶ SciELO has a collection of Latin American e-journals, many of which are covered by Medline
 - ▶ 304 journals titles currently
 - ▶ Of which 134 are published in Brazil
- ▶ Trying to define the core SciELO collection – those journals that get the greatest amount of citation and use
- ▶ Latin American journals find it difficult to get visibility
 - ▶ 56 Latin American journals from 12 countries in ISI Web of Science database
 - ▶ 3.3% of the articles in the ISI Journal Citation Reports are from Latin America

Abel L Packer

The South American landscape and state funded model

- ▶ The number of hits on the SciELO database is rising rapidly and is currently about 1.5 million accesses/month
 - ▶ Many of these come via PubMed
 - ▶ The impact factors of Brazilian journals are rising rapidly too, because of both Open Access and availability via SciELO
- ▶ The funding model for journals will evolve over the period 2004-07
 - ▶ Income from national consortia and research councils will drop from 80% to 40% of the total funding
 - ▶ Income from OA article charges will rise from 20% to 60%
- ▶ Hope to see a radical reduction in publishing costs as publishers move to Internet open electronic publishing services.

Norka Ruiz Bravo

The NIH Public Access Policy

Norka Ruiz Bravo

The NIH Public Access Policy

▶ Final policy

- ▶ NIH-funded investigators are requested to submit an electronic version of the author's final manuscript upon acceptance for publication, resulting from research supported in whole or in part with direct costs from NIH
- ▶ Electronic submission will be made directly to the NLM's Pub Med Central (PMC) digital repository of full-text, peer-reviewed, biomedical, behavioural, and clinical research journals
- ▶ The author will specify the timing of the posting for public accessibility
- ▶ NIH strongly encourages authors to post for public accessibility as soon as possible (and within twelve months of the publisher's official date of final publication)

Norka Ruiz Bravo

The NIH Public Access Policy

- ▶ The policy applies to:
 - ▶ Peer-reviewed publications resulting from research supported in whole or in part with direct costs from NIH
 - ▶ All research and career development award mechanisms, cooperative agreements, contracts, NRSA grants, and NIH intramural research studies
 - ▶ Author's final manuscripts resulting from:
 - > Currently funded NIH research projects OR
 - > Previously supported NIH research projects if they are accepted for publications on or after May 2, 2005

Norka Ruiz Bravo

The NIH Public Access Policy

- ▶ External drivers
 - ▶ New developments in information technology tools
 - ▶ Increasing public use of internet for biomedical information and need for credible information
 - ▶ Congressional interest
- ▶ Internal drivers
 - ▶ NIH needs and objectives

Norka Ruiz Bravo

The NIH Public Access Policy

- ▶ Outcomes & Next Steps
 - ▶ Ramping up submission numbers
 - ▶ Dialogue with public continues:
 - > Public Access Policy Working Group of the NIH National Library of Medicine's Board of Regents established
 - > Composed of stakeholders to advise the Board of Regents on implementation and evaluation of the policy
 - ▶ Continued outreach to funded investigators and other stakeholders

Norka Ruiz Bravo

The NIH Public Access Policy

▶ Why Public Access?

▶ Archive

- > Keep a central archive of NIH-funded research publications—for now and in the future, preserving vital medical research results and information for years to come

▶ Advance science

- > Create an information resource that will make it easier for scientists to mine medical research publications, and for NIH to manage better its entire research investment

▶ Access

- > Provide electronic access to NIH-funded research publications for patients, families, health professionals, teachers, and students

Guylaine Beaudry

Scholarly Journals:
Proposition of an International
Network
as a Strategic Option

rightscom

Guyline Beaudry

Scholarly Journals: Proposition of an International Network as a Strategic Option

▶ Perspectives

- ▶ The not-for-profit journal sector occupies a strategic position in scientific-communication restructuring
- ▶ Develop a global vision characterized by a public-service perspective
- ▶ Present journals as representing a public asset
- ▶ An inclusive public and international strategy is needed

Guyline Beaudry

Scholarly Journals: Proposition of an International Network as a Strategic Option

▶ Observations

- ▶ Not-for-profit journals are a better investment for libraries and universities
- ▶ Hypothesis: Not-for-profit journals don't use (and don't charge...) for the marketing strategies of oligopolies

Guyline Beaudry

Scholarly Journals: Proposition of an International Network as a Strategic Option

▶ **Érudit**

- ▶ A professional and credible alternative to oligopolistic publishers
 - > Perspective of public service – Érudit is a public infrastructure within the university community
 - > Commitment, support and money from the Québec Government and partner institutions
 - > Mission: The promotion and the dissemination of research outcomes
- ▶ Our goals: Open Access, Open formats, Open Source

Guyline Beaudry

Scholarly Journals: Proposition of an International Network as a Strategic Option

- ▶ Range of services for journals
 - ▶ 46 journals
 - ▶ 13,000 articles (20,000 for June 2006)
 - ▶ Current issues : 138 issues/year
 - ▶ Average of 150,000 visits/month
 - ▶ 400,000 documents/month
 - ▶ 82% from international
 - ▶ 90% of the journal articles collection in Érudit are Open Access

Guyline Beaudry

Scholarly Journals: Proposition of an International Network as a Strategic Option

- ▶ 1st level: Regional infrastructure
- ▶ 2nd level: National infrastructure
- ▶ 3rd level: International infrastructure
 - ▶ Expertise in the international university community in a non competitive manner
 - ▶ Network of platforms: many doors to access to a distributed collection
 - ▶ Mutualisation of data (not of services)
 - ▶ Editorial and economic autonomy of each platform

Guyline Beaudry

Scholarly Journals: Proposition of an International Network as a Strategic Option

- ▶ Érudit gives high visibility to scholarly journals and documents in social sciences and humanities, through its strong partnership with similar platforms (national and international)

Breakout groups session 1

Group topics

- ▶ Big Deal
- ▶ Usage-based models
- ▶ Negotiating strength

Common themes

- ▶ Pricing is still creating real difficulty
- ▶ We don't seem to have the market power that the value of our subscriptions would suggest we should
- ▶ Lack of real competition between publishers is a major problem
 - ▶ Means they can make excessive profits
- ▶ Consortia could be extended wider – especially across national boundaries
- ▶ Accurate usage information is essential
- ▶ Usage information needs to be trustworthy
- ▶ Two ways of thinking: “it's hopeless” vs “we can do something”

Big deal issues

- ▶ Reactions to big deals are mixed
- ▶ Some find them very valuable, & they have raised the profile of the library as well as widening participation
- ▶ Others feel that they encourage continuation of a long tail of low-quality journals
 - ▶ But low use does not mean low quality
- ▶ Some libraries see the squeeze-out effect, but it is not universal
- ▶ Lock-in effect means that it is hard to predict prices

Big deal issues

- ▶ Lack of a single voice
- ▶ Some libraries have negotiated prices down even within the big deal structure
- ▶ Is there a difference between commercial and society publishers?
- ▶ Publishers feel secure at the moment
 - ▶ But OA could push them out
 - ▶ For this to happen, OA needs to demonstrate higher citation levels
- ▶ Libraries have to push harder to increase their funding

Usage-based models

- ▶ What counts as a download or “reading”?
- ▶ How reliable are publishers statistics?
 - ▶ How can we trust them?
 - ▶ There can be discrepancies between what the library measures and what the publisher reports
 - ▶ Counter has not fully solved the problem
- ▶ More disadvantages than advantages in usage-based approach
 - ▶ Less predictable
 - ▶ Some research groups will cost the institution a lot more
 - ▶ Will discourage use
 - ▶ Administrative complexity
- ▶ Usage-based pricing could be seen as “fairer”

Usage-based models

- ▶ Banding approaches
 - ▶ How to define a band
 - ▶ Base the band on number of factors
 - ▶ Bands always create problems near the boundary
 - ▶ Publishers have used PPV to put up prices
- ▶ The problem is the price, not the model
- ▶ Publishers are clinging to out-of-date business models
 - ▶ If they do this for too long they may wind up bankrupt

Negotiating strength

- ▶ Consortia are undoubtedly valuable
 - ▶ Good for much more than just pricing negotiations (collections, archiving)
- ▶ What has worked
 - ▶ Power of consortia
 - ▶ Clear position shared by all
 - ▶ Lack of opt-out
 - ▶ Publishers like single invoice
- ▶ Saves library costs – but does it save research costs?

Negotiating strength

- ▶ Long-term viability uncertain – is it an interim measure
 - ▶ Until prices are corrected
- ▶ Because prices are not transparent in the first place, it's not always clear what the savings are
 - ▶ Better measurement needed
 - ▶ Much more transparent publisher policies
 - ▶ NDAs stop open discussion of pricing
- ▶ Consortia can get seed funding that stops after a few years
- ▶ Publishers like dealing with consortia – simpler
 - ▶ But prices do not always fall
- ▶ Service levels vary
- ▶ There are many opportunities for international consortia

Breakout groups session 2

Group topics

- ▶ Repositories
- ▶ Budgeting
- ▶ Research evaluation exercise

Repositories

- ▶ Definitions
- ▶ Institutional vs subject
 - ▶ Does it matter?
- ▶ What is attractive to authors?
- ▶ Not enough examples to illustrate the power of OAI
- ▶ What is it trying to do?
- ▶ Cream of Science as an example
 - ▶ Successful because they take a liberal view of copyright - pre 1998
- ▶ Can they co-exist with journals?
 - ▶ Some have already co-existed for several years

Respositories (Cont.)

- ▶ Overlay journals
 - ▶ Business model: pay for peer review
- ▶ Publishers' views
 - ▶ Fear of being undermined
 - ▶ When the publishers talk to researchers they find that there is not much interest

Budgeting

- ▶ Flexibility is key
- ▶ New demands can't be met from existing funds
 - ▶ Repository costs
 - ▶ Paying author fees
- ▶ Negotiating with the funders to get more, and to be able to use it differently

Research evaluation exercise

- ▶ Role of peer review
- ▶ Scepticism about impact factors
- ▶ Mixed international experience
 - ▶ People chasing what they thought the British system was
 - ▶ Confusion about international drivers
- ▶ Variety of evaluation
 - ▶ Use other methods
 - > Peer review
 - > "Policy impact"
- ▶ Significant disciplinary differences

The Colloquium statement

A statement of principles emerged for which there was a consensus of support

The JISC International Colloquium Statement

- ▶ We believe that communication of results is an essential part of the research process and that research outputs should be disseminated widely and readily, giving access to all
- ▶ Research results are wide in scope, and access to datasets, background documents and other information are as essential as access to the article
- ▶ There are many effective routes to do this; traditional publishing models are only one route
- ▶ Of the emerging models, open access journals and subject repositories and institutional repositories show potential and further development and deployment should be encouraged
- ▶ Institutions and publishers need to investigate the potential of models that allow a graceful and sustainable transition from old to new paradigms
- ▶ It is essential to ensure sustainability of both long term access and preservation of research outputs and related data
- ▶ Any research communication model should continue to give researchers at least the reward and recognition they gain from the present model – or improve on it
- ▶ Authors or authoring institutions should retain the rights to their intellectual property
- ▶ Lack of competition between journals gives us much less "market power" than we would expect from the amount we spend
- ▶ We believe that there are benefits from developing stronger international consortia and in sharing information, knowledge and expertise about how we manage our relations with publishers
- ▶ We should be free to exchange information about negotiations, prices and terms and conditions between libraries and consortia
- ▶ We would like to be open and transparent in our dealings with publishers, and do not wish to be restricted by non-disclosure clauses