Technical Services Faculty Presentations

Technical Services

2017

Green v. Gold, or Chatter About How Green OA is Not Cutting It [open discussion]

Andrée Rathemacher
University of Rhode Island, andree@uri.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.uri.edu/lib_ts_presentations

Part of the Scholarly Communication Commons, and the Scholarly Publishing Commons

Green and Gold OA: What is the Way Forward?

Andrée Rathemacher and Peter Suber

Boston OA Group Meeting

Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts

July 19, 2017

==While the struggle to fill institutional repositories with faculty-authored content is not new, recently disillusionment with Green OA achieved through IRs has been articulated by a number of OA leaders and librarians alike.==

Eric Van de Velde (2016):

The Institutional Repository (IR) is obsolete. Its flawed foundation cannot be repaired. The IR must be phased out and replaced with viable alternatives... After twenty years of promoting IRs, there is no grassroots support. Scholars submit papers to an IR because they have to, not because they want to... I was convinced IRs would disrupt scholarly communication. I was wrong... Green OA must pivot towards alternatives that have viable paths forward: personal repositories, disciplinary repositories, social networks, and innovative combinations of all three.

Richard Poynder (2016, October):

I argued that green OA has "failed as a strategy". And I do believe this. I gave some of the reasons why I do... the most obvious of which is that green OA advocates assumed that once IRs were created they would quickly be filled by researchers self-archiving their work. Yet seventeen years after the Santa Fe meeting, and 22 years after Stevan Harnad began his long campaign to persuade researchers to self-archive, it is clear there remains little or no appetite for doing so, even though researchers are more than happy to post their papers on commercial sites like Academia.edu and ResearchGate.

Clifford Lynch (2017):

The linkage between journal article open access and institutional repository agendas has been a mistake... I believe [IRs] must be disconnected from the OA agenda for journal articles...

Stevan Harnad (2016):

...I fought the fight and lost and now I've left the #OA arena

==**Meanwhile, as some commentators despair over Green OA, Gold OA continues to grow in absolute and relative terms**== (though the *Pay it Forward* report estimates that only about 15% of journal articles are OA at the time of publication). [See OA by the Numbers, Dramatic Growth of Open Access Series, *Physics Today* article.]

==**And efforts to support Gold OA alternatives as well as conversations about flipping the system to Gold appear to be on the rise.**==

Some examples:

Converting Scholarly Journals to Open Access: A Review of Approaches and Experiences

- https://dash.harvard.edu/handle/1/27803834
- announcement 8/5/16 = http://library.harvard.edu/node/4357

Kansas conference - future without APCs -
https://openaccess.ku.edu/symposium, https://lib.ku.edu/news/2016/oa-symposium

Open Library of Humanities <https://www.openlibhums.org/>

OLH is a non-profit organization dedicated to publishing open access scholarship with no author-facing article processing charges (APCs). It is funded by an international consortium of over 180 libraries and the Mellon Foundation. OLH supports academic journals from across the humanities disciplines, as well as hosting its own multidisciplinary journal.

OA2020 Initiative <https://oa2020.org>

Led by the Max Planck Digital Library in Germany, OA2020 is an international initiative that "aims to induce the swift, smooth and scholarly-oriented transformation of today's scholarly journals from subscription to open access publishing."

"The goal is to achieve on a larger scale what SCOAP3 has successfully done for some core journals in the field of High-Energy Physics: to convert journals from subscription to open access by re-directing the existing subscription spend into open access funds, and from these to finance the essential services that publishers provide for scholarly communication, i.e. the administration of peer review, editing, and open access article dissemination. OA2020 would enable an orderly transformation of the current publishing system, since the disruptions would affect only the underlying cash flows, rather than the publishing process itself or the roles of journals and publishers."

The idea is that this transition would be, at minimum, cost-neutral, since there is already enough money in the system.

What is required is for the world's research organizations and their libraries to "withdraw all spending from journal subscriptions and re-allocate those same resources to publishing services… It is incumbent on the research institutions and their libraries to take this important initiating step."

OA2020 has more than 560 worldwide signatory institutions.

OA2020 Initiative (United States) <https://oa2020.us/>

As of March 2017:
- California State University, Northridge
- University of California, Berkeley
- University of California, Davis
- UCSF (University of California, San Francisco)

Signatories to the EoI express agreement upon three aims:
1. Transforming a majority of today's scholarly journals from subscription to OA publishing in accordance with community-specific publication preferences.
2. Pursuing this transformation process by converting resources currently spent on journal subscriptions into funds to support sustainable OA business models.
3. Inviting all parties involved in scholarly publishing, in particular universities, research institutions, funders, libraries, and publishers to collaborate on a swift and efficient transition for the benefit of scholarship and society at large.

When an institution commits to signing the EoI, it agrees to make a good faith effort to devise and implement practical strategies and actions for attaining these OA aims.

From the OA2020 US website: "Why have we signed the Expression of Interest?"
- After decades of efforts, we still don't have universal OA.
- Paywalls are mounting and open access policies are inconsistent.
- The subscription model is not sustainable.
- We need to try something else. Expressing interest in OA2020 can rapidly accelerate OA.
  - This transformation is intended to be developed in accordance with community- specific publication preferences, and with the participation of all stakeholders (e.g., universities, research institutions, funders, libraries, scholarly societies, publishers, and authors).

- OA2020 is flexible and non-prescriptive.
    - In practical terms and to realize OA2020's aims, there are numerous possible models by which existing funds could be repurposed to achieve the "flipping."
    - For instance, one widely discussed model relies upon APCs whereby authors use combinations of library, university, and/or grant funding to cover the costs of publication. The resulting article is then made freely available to users.
    - In other "cooperative" models, consortia of various stakeholders such as libraries, journals, professional societies, academic presses, funders, and/or governments may join together to fund OA publishing infrastructures by pooling their previous allocations from subscriptions, subsidies, membership dues, grants, endowments, and the like.
    - None of these models is mutually exclusive, and each may be used in conjunction with one another across the scholarly publishing landscape.
- We're interested in repurposing subscription funds.

Pay It Forward project <http://icis.ucdavis.edu/?page_id=286>

This study investigated the financial implications for the academy if an APC-based OA business model were widely adopted.

Conducted by the University of California, Davis, and the California Digital Library, on behalf of the University of California Libraries, and with collaborating libraries at Harvard University, Ohio State University, and the University of British Columbia, the Pay It Forward project addressed the financial ramifications for the types of research institutions whose affiliated scholars generate a preponderance of the scholarly literature.

Three major conclusions from the project are as follows:

1. For the most research-intensive North American research institutions, the total cost to publish in a fully article processing charge-funded journal market will exceed current library journal budgets;

2. This cost difference could be covered by grant funds, already a major source of funding for publishing fees; but

3. Ultimately, author-controlled discretionary funds that incentivize authors to act as informed consumers of publishing services are necessary to introduce both real competition and pricing pressures into the journal publishing system. Discretionary funds for authors exist today, in the form of research grants, personal research accounts, endowed chair funds, and departmental funds, but the consistent application of these funds for this purpose would, in some cases, require new funding from the institution.

Other developments to note by funders:
- Wellcome Open Research <https://wellcomeopenresearch.org/>
  - Research-funder created platform that provides for immediate OA publication of research Wellcome has funded or co-funded, in partnership with F1000.
- Robert Wood Johnson Foundation supports the cost of making the Annual Review of Public Health OA <https://annualreviewsnews.org/2017/04/06/public-health-oa/>
- Gates Foundation will subsidize OA publication of articles by its researchers in *Science* family of journals <http://www.sciencemag.org/news/2017/02/gates-foundation-strikes-deal-allo w-its-researchers-publish-science-journals>

Green OA [20 minutes]

- What are the obstacles to achieving Green OA that have caused some former supporters to claim that Green OA through IRs has "failed"? Are they wrong?

- Even Clifford Lynch doesn't suggest we abandon depositing faculty work in the IR, especially for faculty who are willing depositors. But do we think it is possible that many institutions will be able to deposit in their IRs the work of most of their authors, with or without the presence of an OA policy? And if it is the case that only a minority of faculty will participate, should we keep trying to grow participation anyway, to keep the volume of work in the IR growing, even if the growth is slow?

- Is Green OA helping us move toward a future where most scholarship is OA? Does Green OA have the power to eventually flip the system? If so, how long will this take?

- What about disciplinary repositories? What should the respective roles of IRs and disciplinary repositories be, and how should they coexist? Along the same lines, what is the role for new tools like the Open Science Framework from the Center for Open Science?

Gold OA [20 minutes]

As outlined in the Harvard report, there are many approaches to converting subscription journals to open access. Some rely on APCs and others do not. Some involve the participation of libraries and others do not.

Approaches that involve library participation (from Harvard report)
- *Low-cost infrastructure and volunteer effort (hosting journals / library publishing)*
- *Bundling APCs with subscription licenses*
- *Joining consortium or library partnership subsidy (e.g. SCOAP3, Open Library of Humanities)*
- *[Paying APCs through institutional Open Access funds] - not part of report*

- Even those of us working in scholcomm who have not had time to read the entire 223-page Harvard report will be familiar with some of these strategies. Thinking about these strategies, how do they scale? Could efforts to flip the <u>system</u> to gold be successful?

- The California libraries that signed the OA2020 Expression of Interest have a desire to "rapidly accelerate OA," stating that "there are numerous possible models by which existing funds could be repurposed" to achieve widescale OA. Yet to my knowledge, no concrete plans or specific first steps have emerged. Does anyone have any insight on what the U.S. signatories have in mind?

- Is there any way major publishers can be "forced" to convert their portfolios to OA? Who will win that fight? If no, what other strategies might work?

- Will a Gold OA system remain dominated by the same major publishers as the toll access system? Devil's advocate question: Would that be a bad thing? (c.f. Björk)

- What about APCs? Will a Gold OA system become APC-dominated? Will this vary by discipline? What are the ramifications if it does?

- What about cooperative models like SCOAP3 and Open Library of Humanities? Are they sustainable? Could similar models work in other disciplines?

<mark>Concluding Questions [15 minutes]</mark>

- Thinking of what we, as librarians, can take action on, what methods for achieving OA seem most promising? Given limited time and resources, where should we be focusing our collective energies?

- Apart from what we do day-to-day to achieve short-term goals, what should we be doing to achieve long-term goals?

Sources:

Corbett, Hillary. (2017, February 6). RE: [SCHOLCOMM] The Death of Scholarly Communciation(s)? [Online discussion group]. Retrieved from http://lists.ala.org/sympa/arc/scholcomm/2017-02/msg00067.html

Gaines, Anne. (2017, February 3). RE: [SCHOLCOMM] The Death of Scholarly Communciation(s)? [Online discussion group]. Retrieved from http://lists.ala.org/sympa/arc/scholcomm/2017-02/msg00054.html

Harnad, S. [AmSciForum]. (2016, March 23). @mbeisen @RickyPo @Archivalia_kg @CharlesOppenh @petersuber @mbeisen but I agree-I fought the fight and lost and now I've left the #OA arena [Tweet]. Retrieved from https://twitter.com/amsciforum/status/712852714389172224

Kramer, D. (2017). Steady, strong growth is expected for open-access journals. *Physics Today*, 70(5), 24-28. https://doi.org/10.1063/PT.3.3550

Lynch, C. (2017). Updating the agenda for academic libraries and scholarly communications. *College & Research Libraries*, 78(2), 126-130. Retrieved from http://crl.acrl.org/index.php/crl/article/view/16577/18023

Morrison, H. (n. d.) Dramatic Growth of Open Access Series. Retrieved July 10, 2017 from The Imaginary Journal of Poetic Economics http://poeticeconomics.blogspot.ca/2006/08/dramatic-growth-of-open-access-series.html

OA by the numbers. Retrieved July 10, 2017 from the Open Access Directory: http://oad.simmons.edu/oadwiki/OA_by_the_numbers

Poynder, R. (2016, September 22). Q&A with CNI's Clifford Lynch: Time to re-think the institutional repository? [Blog post]. Retrieved from http://poynder.blogspot.co.uk/2016/09/q-with-cnis-clifford-lynch-time-to-re_22.html

Poynder, R. (2016, October 5). Institutional repositories: Response to comments [Blog post]. Retrieved from http://poynder.blogspot.co.uk/2016/10/institutional-repositories-response-to.html

Solomon, David J., Mikael Laakso, and Bo-Christer Björk (authors). Peter Suber (editor). (2016). Converting Scholarly Journals to Open Access: A Review of Approaches and Experiences. Retrieved from https://dash.harvard.edu/handle/1/27803834

Van de Velde, E. (2016, July 24). Let IR RIP [Blog post]. Retrieved from http://scitechsociety.blogspot.com/2016/07/let-ir-rip.html