Cites & Insights

Crawford at Large

Libraries • Policy • Technology • Media

The Front

The Big Deal and The Damage Done: Available Now

I just published *The Big Deal and the Damage Done*, an analysis of academic library spending from 2000 through 2010 to show the results of Big Deals and other current serials spending.

This study partly grows out of recent statements by people who really should know better that Big Deals actually *solved* the serials crisis—and at least one insightful post noting the damage done to the humanities and to library flexibility.

Portions of the study will appear in the July 2013 *Cites & Insights.* The full 131-page study, analyzing libraries by budget size, sector and Carnegie classification, is now available as a $16.50 paperback or a $9.99 PDF ebook (6x9).

The ebook has multicolor graphs—lots of them—but the colors are all designed so the b&w paperback should be fully readable.

Intersections

Hot Times for Open Access

When I devoted 63,000 words to open access in CATCHING UP WITH OPEN ACCESS (*C&I* 13:1 and 13:2, January and February 2013)—twice as much text as my book *Open Access: What You Need to Know Now*—I thought I was done with the topic for 2013. That mega-roundup caught me up to December 19, 2012. Since I'd previously gone three years between OA essays, I figured I could wait another year. I'd take my book, Peter Suber's *Open Access* and about half a dozen items tagged for my Ore-

gon/Washington preconference and put together notes for that conference in March-April 2013.

And then along came…lots of stuff. A petition. White House action. A new legislative initiative. New quarrels among the high priests and would-be mavens of open access. New attempts by Big Publishers to co-opt OA in order to retain their profits. UK stuff I was trying to avoid.

Come March 19, 2013, the half-dozen (now up to 14) items I'd tagged as "oa-precon" were dwarfed by 106 items tagged "oa." Sifting through both sets, I managed to reduce the total to 108—but that's still a *lot*, especially for a three-month period. Only one tag has more entries (I break down things like ebooks, libraries, social networks and copyright into hyphenated tags), and then only slightly more.

These are hot times for open access. Maybe not a tipping point, certainly not where *everything* will be in a couple of years, but more action—and even more progress—than I'd seen in a while.

What we have here is a hybrid: part catching up with three vibrant months in the development of OA, part supplemental material for my OA preconference in Vancouver, Washington. This issue appears slightly *after* that preconference—but attendees got early access to it. That hybrid nature may affect the organization, always sketchy in any case. It also means a few things are noted that wouldn't qualify as new material.

Before We Begin…

In the course of working on this essay, working on the OA precon and reading up-to-the-minute developments (e.g., the mass resignation of the editorial board of *Journal of Library Administration*), I came to two realizations:

➢ After more than two decades of being an OA independent—observing OA, writing about it, but a semi-neutral observer—I'm off the fence. I'm now an OA advocate, for the reasons I've been discussing over the years.

➤ When I ask the question "Who *needs* OA?" I'm now realizing that one answer is in the mirror: I do. For decades, and especially in the past few years, I've been an "unaffiliated researcher/scholar" without access to most subscription journals. I will assert that I've provided valuable writing in the library field—and I will also assert that I could have done more, and done it more effectively, if I'd had the kind of access that anybody at, say, Harvard or Berkeley would take for granted. Not that either Harvard or Berkeley can provide the resources they'd *like* to. What's true for me now will be true for most of you if you leave academia, move to a smaller institution or retire (with some exceptions): If you want to keep writing about and understanding the field, you'll be at a serious disadvantage because you won't have access to much of the work that others have done *and given away*. So, yes, it's *personal*—for me and, I think, for you as well.

Definitions, Background, Books

How do you define open access? In my book, I used three levels:

➤ Free online access to journal articles. [minimal]
➤ Open access literature is available online to be read for free by anyone, anytime, anywhere—as long as they have Internet access [basic]
➤ Open access requires that refereed journal articles be fully and freely available on the open Internet, on or before the date of formal publication, to be read, downloaded, distributed, printed and used for any legal purpose (including text manipulation, datamining and other derivative purposes), without permission or other barriers. [my summation of the Budapest, Bethesda and Berlin statements].

Here's Wikipedia as of March 19. 2013: "The practice of providing unrestricted access via the Internet to peer-reviewed scholarly journal articles."

Peter Suber offers this definition: "Open-access literature is digital, online, free of charge, and free of most copyright and licensing restrictions." Those definitions are all somewhat similar, but by no means the same.

In "A simple definition for open access: a proposal to open the discussion," [posted January 8, 2013](#) by Heather Morrison at *The Imaginary Journal of Poetic Economics*, Morrison argues that Suber's definition should be the preferred one—explicitly arguing that the BBB definition should *not* be considered standard.

Why? Because Morrison really, *vehemently* dislikes CC-BY, the easiest way to fulfill the BBB requirements. She even used that as the basis for her doctoral dissertation. And since she uses one of the more restrictive licenses, including the "Same As" clause that I can never be sure I'm obeying, I'll only quote selected portions of her argument for "articulating the commons." Three elements she says should be considered:

• the traditional concept of reciprocity that is an expectation with gift-giving in many various societies, as reported by Mauss;

• developing a sustainable knowledge commons could benefit from the research of Ostrom, for example the importance of developing community expectations and sanctions in sustaining a commons; and,

• expanding the limitations of western concepts of ownership through incorporating concepts from traditional knowledges.

Without reading and examining her whole dissertation, it appears that Morrison believes open access should *prevent* reuses that make money for people—note the "sanctions" and "gift-giving" portions.

What follows, an explicit attack on CC-BY, includes a set of "myths" and "facts" that looks a lot like a gallery of straw men. Consider the first:

> Myth: Creative Commons licenses are for works that are free of charge to users, just like open access is meant to be.

That has never been true, CC never says it is true and it's abundantly clear that it's not true. Refuting it is pointless. This discussion appears to boil down to a distaste for the possibility that somebody else could make money by using OA—for example, that a publisher could combine selected OA articles, add commentary and indexing, and produce a paid publication. I'd consider that not only reasonable but also desirable: The publisher is adding value and should be praised, not forbidden.

One other "fact" strains to make a point. Yes, it's true that a CC license does not—and cannot—assure that somebody will *keep a document on an open server for all eternity*. Yes, it's true that a renegade OA publisher could decide to take down its online OA archives; CC can't prevent that. *No license can*. What Morrison seems to imply—that the publisher could make its previous OA articles non-OA—is, however, simply wrong. If those articles have been copied elsewhere, if they're in aggregated archives, they will

continue to be OA, legally and freely copyable and distributable. You *cannot* reverse a CC license for publications to which it's already been applied: that's why CC licenses are carefully crafted. (The post is also interesting for its comments—and for how Morrison responds to criticism.)

This discussion or debate continued; it has its own section a little further on.

Policy guidelines for the development and promotion of open access

That's the title of a UNESCO publication written by Alma Swan and available here in PDF and EPUB form. It's a 76-page publication "to demystify the concept of Open Access (OA) and to provide concrete steps on putting relevant policies in place."

The publication is designed as an overall OA introduction, but hardly a policy-neutral one. It uses the Budapest definition for OA (but quotes the entire declaration, *way* too long for a useful definition) and adds the Bethesda and Berlin declarations.

I'm including it here because it's a useful resource—but it doesn't add much to the discussion of definitions and it's mostly aimed at policy-makers.

HowOpenIsIt?

I'm not wild about the SmushEverythingTogetherIntoOneWordWithInterCaps title, but this guide (available here in three different languages with supporting materials)—prepared by PLOS, SPARC and OASPA—may be a useful quick guide for some people. It's designed to be a single-sheet printed brochure, using six "core components of OA" to determine how something fits "across the spectrum between Open Access and Closed Access." It does *not* provide a net definition of OA, unless you define OA as meeting the top level on all six areas (reader rights, reuse rights, copyrights, author posting rights, automatic posting and machine readability). The site with links says the goals of the guide are to "Clarify the definition of OA"—among other things—and I don't think it does that. I think it *complicates* the definition of OA by, essentially, making most real-world OA "not really open."

It's probably worth noting that the highest level for reuse is "Generous reuse & remixing rights (e.g. CC BY license)", with more restrictive CC licenses stated as being lower on the spectrum toward closed access. The levels are clear: *Any embargo of any length* drops the access below full OA—as does waiting beyond publication date to make *published* versions available to third-party repositories. The most controversial section may be the "Machine Readabil-

ity" section, which lists this as the requirement for full OA status:

> Article full text, metadata, citations, & data, including supplementary data, provided in community machine-readable standard formats through a community standard API or protocol.

The second level drops "provided in community machine-readable standard definitions" and substitutes "may be crawled or accessed." There's a clear issue here: What *are* "community machine-readable standard formats" for text, etc.? I'm guessing PDF doesn't qualify and .xls files probably don't qualify. Is that too restrictive? (Is the goal to expand OA as much as possible—or to define it as stringently as possible?)

OA journal launch services

The Open Access Directory is full of worthwhile content on OA. I'm noting this particular page here because it shows a surprising range of services to help launch new Gold OA journals. (I will assert that "OA journal" *means* Gold OA journal.) It's a live page (although, at this writing, it was last modified on August 21, 2012). At the moment, it lists eleven services, with links to each one. This isn't a list of OA journal management software: That's elsewhere in OAD (and is really a list of open-source journal management software).

The two best current books on OA

I'm going to end this section (and move on to a directly related section) by quoting from two posts by library bloggers, both commenting on Peter Suber's *Open Access* and my own *Open Access: What You Need to Know Now*. I'll assert that these are the two best current books on OA; I've now read Suber's book; and I'm not in a position to judge which is better and for whom.

John Dupuis praises Suber's book in "Reading Diary: Open Access by Peter Suber," posted September 26, 2012 at *Confessions of a Science Librarian*. (DuPuis also reviewed my book on June 6, 2011, a thoughtful and generous review.) Excerpts:

> First, let's get the important stuff out of the way. Peter Suber's book *Open Access* is an important book. You should read it, you should buy (or recommend) a copy for your library. You should buy a hundred boxes and give a copy to every faculty member at your institution.
>
> And not just because it's a blazingly wonderful book — although it mostly is — but because it's a book that sets the stage for an intelligent, rational, fact-based discussion on the future of scholarly publishing. It does so in language familiar and accessible to faculty and administrators, particularly those beyond

the sciences who might be unfamiliar with and skeptical the idea of open access. It makes OA seem reasonable and progressive, it makes its advocates seem calm and forward-thinking. It makes the wholesale transformation of scholarly publishing into something more open seem almost inevitable…

…this book is definitely aimed at scholars rather than the general public. While of great interest to higher education administrators or librarians, the goal of this book is to spread the word to faculty and researchers….

[For t]he librarian's perspective on learning about and advocating for OA, Walt Crawford's book is a better bet. In fact, the books are complementary more than competing so both books are useful to have…

Finally, who would I recommend this book to? First of all, this book is a must-have for any academic library. No question about that. And even many public libraries would find it of interest to their patrons. And it would certainly make a great gift or prize at any library/faculty event. And I'm only half joking when I suggest giving a copy to every faculty member on campus.

I see nothing to quarrel with there. In another paragraph, Dupuis suggests that Suber's discussions of libraries *could* lead faculty to believe "that their libraries need rescuing rather than coming away with the idea that their libraries are full of librarians who would be happy joining them storming the barricades." That might be true, although—as Suber notes in a comment—it was definitely not his intention. It's worth quoting part of Suber's comment, a quote from a July 2011 Richard Poynder interview in *Information Today*:

Librarians lobby for OA mandates. They write to their representatives in the legislature. They make phone calls and visit. They network and organize. They communicate with one another, with their patrons, and with the public. They launch, maintain, and fill repositories. They write up their experiences, case studies, surveys, and best practices. They pay attention. On average, they understand the issues better than any other stakeholder group, including researchers, administrators, publishers, funders, and policymakers…

There are too many OA advocates who denigrate librarians (even one is too many). Suber is *not* among that number—I believe he's always been aware of librarian contributions to OA.

Aaron Tay posted "5 things I learnt about Open Access after reading Crawford's & Suber's books" on January 19, 2013 at *Musings about librarianship*. It's a great discussion from a librarian who has not, in the past, been actively involved in OA-related areas, but who expects to be involved in OA in 2013.

Though I haven't exactly stuck my head in the sand either and have read the occasional blog post or news article on open access that streams past me on Twitter or Facebook (of which the Scholarly Kitchen blog posts seem very popular) and also read discussions on the topic on Facebook, Twitter, Friendfeed etc by librarians in the trenches who are promoting Open Access.

However various parts of my work in 2012 including chance conversations with research staff, started me down the path of considering Open Access seriously and towards the end of 2012, I decided to prepare for 2013 by reading formally on the topic and both books which aims at quickly bringing people (Crawford's probably more for Librarians & Suber's more for researchers) up to speed with the concept of Open Access seem to be written just for people like me.

Both books are short, Crawford's weighs in at 71 pages and Suber's at 241. So I was curious how much material in both were new to me. There can't be that much to know about the basic principles of Open Access that I didn't read before in some blog post or article via Twitter right?

Actually I was wrong, I did learn quite a few things.

I'll just offer the "five things" without Tay's discussion—which is absolutely worth reading, and you should go to the original and read it!

1. The concepts of Gratis OA and Libre OA vs Green OA and Gold OA—Crawford

2. Gold OA does not necessarily require Article Processing Charges (APC)—Crawford

3. Why Journal articles are low hanging fruit for OA compared to most books—Suber

4. Different types of Mandates by institutions and funders—Suber

5. The whole chapters in Suber's book for Economics (chapter 7) and Causalities (chapter 8)—Suber

Tay found those chapters 7 and 8 "quite hard going" and thinks that "these are very complicated issues which requires [Suber] to write this way and no doubt even what is written is a simplification bypassing some technical issues." That's probably true.

I'm going to quote the whole "Other remarks comparing both books" section:

Overall I enjoyed and can highly recommend both books. Crawford's book is extremely clear, though because of its brevity covers some issues in lesser depth which I didn't notice until reading Suber's book.

Suber's book is longer (but still short) and more technical and like many librarians I enjoy learning details (I will probably start exploring the links in the endnotes to get a fuller picture soon), so I loved it too.

I do wish he could have written a much longer book, as I got the sense that behind every sentence he wrote, lurks a bigger story and he himself worries a little in the preface that "fellow specialists" might wonder if he is cutting too much material or simplifying too much, but again this was what he set out to do, write for busy people.to ensure they get the "correct formulation" of the idea and not write something to debate with other specialists in open access.

That said, given the difficulty I had with chapters 7 and 8, I suspect if I had gone directly to Suber's book without first going through Crawford's much more of Suber's book would be difficult, so it's fortunate I did the books in the order I did.

Both have two concluding chapters which is basically a "What next?" chapter, I prefer Crawford's one on "taking action" and "exploring open access" (for keeping up) to Suber's "The future" and "Self help" but then again Crawford is pretty much writing for librarians, while Suber is addressing the researchers and it seems stakeholders at institutions and libraries (University Librarians?), so it is expected which one would be more relevant to me.

That said, even Crawford's book is scant on practical details on strategies for popularizing repositories, how to encourage deposits, strategies for promoting open access awareness etc, but of course, neither book was meant to address those issues as useful as it might be to a librarian like myself and given that it is still relatively early days in the open access story, such a book might not be suitable to be written yet.

Readers probably already know that my book was the length it was *as a requirement by the publisher*—30,000 words maximum—but may not know that I found that limit liberating: I knew I *had* to be concise, clearly not my normal approach. Suber's book *is* longer but is also just an introduction to the mass of excellent writing he's done on the subject, and the links in the endnotes lead to much fuller discussions.

Tay winds up his post with a concluding section, one I suggest you read in the original.

The "Open access" article in Wikipedia

I was going to add some additional comments about definition and typology based on this fairly lengthy article, after quoting Wikipedia's leading definition. And…I just can't. The article is a mess in a way that Wikipedia's policies not only make possible but also almost enforce. It's "neutral" in a manner that is effectively anti-OA; it's a mess in other ways (e.g., after "OA can be provided in three ways:" are the description of the *two* colors of OA); and…well, I just can't. You may find the article useful, but approach it with caution. (As always, the Talk section is in some ways more revealing than the article itself.)

CC BY

As noted earlier, Heather Morrison seems to have gone on a crusade against CC BY (that is: open to all uses as long as credit is given) as part of the ideal definition of OA. There's been some discussion of this, as it seems pretty clear to others (myself included) that anything more restrictive than CC BY is *not* full OA.

Clarifications about CC BY in the UK Open Access Policy

I continue to avoid full discussion of the UK situation; there's only so much room, and there are aspects to the UK situation that I choose not to investigate enough to fully understand. But this February 28, 2013 item by Timothy Vollmer in the Creative Commons news weblog does deserve notice. Briefly, the UK policy requires that articles funded through the Research Councils UK (RCUK) must carry a CC BY license. When the House of Lords had a "consultation period" (I think that's like an open comments period), it yielded a 419-page set of comments that's described as including "some misinformation about how the CC BY License operates." (No, I have *not* read the 419-page set, linked to from the web post.)

Here's a summarized set of reasons CC BY should *not* be retained:

- it would promote "misuse of research or would cause authors to "lose control of their work"

- third party rights negotiations for content that authors wish to include within an openly licensed article would prove too difficult

- open licensing provides less protection against plagiarism

- CC BY is not widely used in OA publishing

- authors should choose licensing conditions, not funders

The post says "These claims are confusing, misguided, or not backed up by evidence." It links to a response from Creative Commons and CC UK, provided in both HTML and PDF form. Large seg-

ments of that response (I *could* use the whole thing, of course: It's CC BY, as you'd expect):

A few commenters suggested that the use of CC BY licenses will cause authors to "lose control of their work" or "enable the misuse of research, for example by presenting extracts in ways that appear to contradict or undermine the author's meaning." Creative Commons licenses are copyright licenses that grant certain rights to the public while retaining others, such as the right of attribution, to the author of the article… [followed by some useful detail]

CC licenses contain a number of additional mechanisms designed to protect an author's reputation. These include a "no endorsement, no sponsorship" clause, which is a standard feature of all CC licences. This clause prohibits users of a work from implicitly or explicitly asserting or implying any connection with, sponsorship or endorsement by the author of that work without express, prior written consent…

We are unaware of instances where the CC BY license (as opposed to other factors) was the cause per se of a work being misrepresented. The CC BY license does not exacerbate the long perceived problem in scholarly communication that research may be misinterpreted or miscommunicated. This challenge has always existed…

Some commentators argued against the CC BY requirement because they claim that where articles include third party material—such as photography or artwork as is common in the humanities and social science research—it will be unlikely that those rights holders will be in a position to grant the necessary rights to allow the author of the article to release the work under CC BY.

In general, CC BY does not purport to license or sublicense in any respect any content that the author doesn't own or control. Indeed, by the very terms of the CC licenses, the licenses cover only the rights held by the licensor. The particular concern here can be managed by clearly stating the terms on which the third party content (which is not under the CC license) is made available to users. Other open access publishers such as PLOS and BioMed Central have used this practice for years…

At least one commenter suggested that the adoption of CC BY "[(a)] offers virtually no protection against plagiarism ... [and (b)] unfettered creative commons licensing would constitute a serious infringement of intellectual property rights and pose a threat to UK intellectual capital." As to (a), plagiarism is the practice of taking someone else's work and passing it off as one's own. Plagiarism is a completely orthogonal issue to copyright infringement, and there is simply no evidence we know of that would support a claim that CC

BY would promote or encourage plagiarism in a way any other solution would not as well. As to (b), CC licensing does not infringe IP rights; rather, it is a conditional permission for the public to exercise some rights on specific terms that can only enhance UK intellectual capital by making it more readily available for wide distribution and innovative use.

One commenter says, "no major commercial publisher or not-for-profit academic press allows a commercial or derivative use of their publications." This is simply incorrect. Sustainable, professional, and respected open access publishers such as PLOS and BioMed Central have published hundreds of thousands of peer-reviewed articles under the CC BY license. And, both Springer and Wiley have begun to offer CC BY on many of their publications. The BOAI10 Expert Group on Open Access recommends CC BY[8] the preferred license for open access publication.

There's more—and it's useful.

Researchers opt to limit uses of open-access publications

This piece is by Richard Van Noorden, posted February 6, 2013 at *Nature News*, and it must be said that *Nature*'s relationship to OA is complex at best. Here's the lead paragraph:

Academics are—slowly—adopting the view that publicly funded research should be made freely available. But data released yesterday suggest that, given the choice, even researchers who publish in open-access journals want to place restrictions on how their papers can be re-used—for example, sold by others for commercial profit.

Where does that link take you? To a post that I'd consider flawed anecdata: the choices made by a few hundred authors who submitted papers to *Scientific Reports* during a four-month period in which they could choose from three CC licenses—*after* a six-month period in which they didn't have CC-BY as an option at all. Only 5% chose CC-BY….which *consistently* appeared as the last choice in a set of three.

This serves as the focal point of what comes off as a slanted argument for restrictive licenses and, indeed, a desire to undermine the effectiveness of OA. Consider:

Many publishers are also arguing against CC-BY, concerned in part about the loss of income if others can resell open-access works. Indeed, the International Association of Scientific, Technical and Medical Publishers, a global trade organization based in Oxford, UK, is working on an alternative open-access licence that does not allow commercial or

derivative use in reprints, abstracts or adaptations, but explicitly allows text-mining and translations.

Given that "commercial" can be defined very broadly, this sounds like an attempt to make OA non-OA—and, for that matter, limiting OA in a manner that doesn't allow reuse within paid derivations is seriously limited. (OK, I'm biased in this area as well. As are, apparently, SPARC and OASPA—see above.) Martin Hall offers a good example of *why* such restrictive licenses are problematic:

> For example, a social scientist who used an NC licence to prevent their work being used in textbooks without the payment of royalties might also be keeping it from appearing on any website that carries advertising content.

A comment includes a list of OA publishers who *do* use CC BY and says it includes "the vast majority of good open access journals." Another comment notes that at least one Nature Publishing Group journal that offers OA options *charges more* to use the CC-BY license. And, sigh, Stevan Harnad offers a lengthy comment that essentially calls CC BY over-reaching.

Why we must support CC-BY (e.g. RCUK policy). It's good for us and good for the world

I rarely quote Peter Murray-Rust because of his dismissive attitude toward libraries and librarians, which I find professionally and personally offensive, but—as with Heather Morrison, who I also normally avoid—there are exceptions. Such as this February 10, 2012 post at *petermr's blog*.

> Unfortunately, the post is very much typical of PMR, as in this parenthetical observation: "(the publishers help to create lots of FUD, academics are arrogant, and libraries have not taken a coherent position)." Whereas scientists are not arrogant and *have* taken a coherent position? And then we get this (copied and pasted without alteration):

> There is a huge waste of money in #scholpub because of its non-competitiveness and inefficiencies. It costs 7 USD to put a paper in Arxiv and perhaps 250 to review it. Current journals charge 2000-7000 USD per paper (whether "Gold" or "Green"). There is no evidence that mainstream heavy-traffic subscription journals where "Green" is practiced cost less than "Gold". It's simply that in one case the university bears the cost while in others the funder bears it. In most (but not all) the cost of subscriptions and of author charges is ultimately borne by the taxpayer (in subscription the students also pay). I don't know the figures, but the average price of a mainstream subscription journal article is around 5000 USD, considerably higher than the av-

erage APC. This process is not subject to the market = the good is not substitutable.

The sentence beginning "Current journals" is simply false for a majority of journals, whether gold or green, thus undermining much of what follows. All of which takes away from the excellent points PMR makes a bit later:

> CC-BY provides far more value than its detractors give it credit for. CC-BY gives real value beyond the ability to re-use. Let's look at some:
>
> * It can be mined and indexed. No robot can understand licences from non-CC publishers (cf RSC) because no human can. Therefore no mining.
> * It can be repurposed. I can extract all the maps of biodiversity and collate them. I can annotate them. I can correct errors automatically. I can do this for 10,000 in an hour.
> * It can be used for teaching. In New Zealand the Copyright Clearance system forbids fair use. It's almost impossible to teach without paying huge amounts of money. The University of Auckland pays 1-2 million in permissions for teaching. For teaching.

And this:

> The criticism of CC-BY looks at only one small part of the equation. In the larger picture CC-BY provides far more public good. It's a pity that it will cost early adopters. But countries can and should and do act unilaterally for the good of humankind.

All of which could be said without insulting librarians and academics and without tossing in erroneous generalizations about charges. Too bad it wasn't.

Rockefeller University Press: CC-BY is not essential for Open Access

This one's from Richard Poynder on March 12, 2013 at *Open and Shut?*—and Poynder calls the CC-BY requirement (for RCUK-funded articles involving APCs and, likely, for Wellcome-funded articles) "what may turn out to be the most divisive aspect of the new policy."

> Which leads into a link to an editorial by Mike Rossner, executive director of the Rockefeller University Press. And Poynder says this:

> It is important to note that over the years RUP has gained for itself an enviable reputation as one of the most (if not *the* most) OA-friendly of all the traditional publishers.

"Traditional" may be key there, since by my lights RUP isn't particularly OA-friendly: It imposes a six-month embargo and uses the next-most restrictive CC license (CC BY-NC-SA) once that embargo ends. As far as I'm concerned, a six-month embargo disqualifies

a journal from being considered "OA-friendly," but maybe that's just me. It is clear that Rossner is more *delayed*-OA-friendly than many publishers.

The argument seems to boil down to this:

> What is certain, he adds, is that no subscription publisher is going to embrace CC-BY—since it would permit the wholesale resale of that publisher's content, and so undermine its subscription sales.

As the discussion continues, that becomes clearer: If OA is defined in a way that protects subscription revenues, that can't include CC-BY. Which also, to my mind and certainly by BBB standards, means that it can't be OA.

Rossner argues that *everybody* should use CC-BY-NC, which opens an enormous can of worms, especially given the difficulty with "NC." Add an ad to your site, and you can't use OA content? At least Rossner's up front in the interview: RUP is *not* an OA publisher and has no plans to become one.

It's a fairly long interview, followed by some interesting comments, the first of which undermines some of what's said.

Heather vs. Heather

I was going to close this section with a somewhat nontraditional link to a Google+ post with a long conversation following it. The brief post is by Heather Piwowar [on March 13, 2013](). Here's the post in its entirety:

> Here's what CC-BY does for textmining: if a publisher doesn't provide useful terms+tools, someone else can mirror the literature and do a better job.
>
> Winner=Science.

Short and to the point. The first comment notes that CC-BY also means that the results of text-mining can be offered in full context. And then there's this, from Heather Morrison:

> There is nothing in CC-BY to stop the downstream commercial site from setting up their service behind a paywall. Scholars who gave away their work for OA or even paid article processing fees could be prevented from accessing the better version by the paywall. Nice try, though - it's not easy defending an illogical argument.

The first part of that is *absolutely true*: People who add value can charge for that value-add. The last sentence is meaningless and condescending. As Heather Piwowar notes:

> Correct. If the new version is better, someone added value, they can charge for that... seems fair to me. Nothing to stop someone else setting up a service for free, if they find a way to make that work. I don't appreciate the condescension at the end,

> Heather. Feel free to disagree with me, I know you do, but condescension is surely unnecessary.

The discussion continues. Heather Morrison apparently feels that it's *wrong* for somebody to be able to add value and charge for it, and throws up paywalls as a straw man. E.g.:

> This means that if a funding agency in the developing world were convinced to follow the RCUK push-for-CC-BY example, then there is a good chance that they would end up giving their work away to produce for-profit services that only scholars in the developed world can afford.

But, but, but…the articles *would still be freely available*. Just not the new value-added services. Morrison brings up "fairness" without much explication (and tosses out Demon Elsevier to make her case), and Piwowar later makes her stance clear:

> I believe the lack of standard open licenses for scholarship will have the opportunity cost of drastically fewer downstream services. I firmly believe a bigger pie... even if it some slices are too expensive for some people to afford... is a better solution.

Value-added commercial services *do not reduce* the value of freely available articles. They enhance that value. The fact that a commercial researcher can (and does) use resources available in a public or academic library to support people in ways that I can't afford *in no way* reduces the worth of those resources for my own free use.

There's another related discussion in another social network, but I'll leave that for others to explore.

As I say, that was *going* to be the last item in this section, but then these came along:

Is DOAJ inadvertently promoting publisher power over scholars?

That is, you guessed it, Heather Morrison, [on March 27, 2013]() at *The Imaginary Journal of Poetic Economics*. And she's upset that *DOAJ* now allows you to narrow a search based on the CC license. She admits that this can be useful, but…

> However, when this is used to calculate the percentage of DOAJ journals using a particular CC license, [as Peter Suber does in this post]() this inadvertently makes the assumption that choice of licensing is made (should be made?) by journals and publishers, not by scholars.

Note that Suber's post (at Google+, also on March 27) identifies the breakdown of journal-level licenses (basically, just under one-third of journals have standing licenses; just over one-half of those licenses are CC-BY, with the others more restrictive). Su-

ber is "very glad to see that CC-BY is the most commonly used license among DOAJ journals."

Since Morrison's been pretty much the only supposedly pro-OA person arguing *against* CC-BY, it's not surprising that she objects to this. She "recommends" that journals shouldn't establish the licenses: authors should.

> This is the option that I recommend for journals, the one that is most compatible with author choice and Freedom for scholarship in the internet age. The last thing that scholars need in the transition to open access is to replace subscription-publisher overlords with open access-publisher overlords.

Really? "open-access-publisher overlords"? Freedom with a capital-F, where the Freedom sought is the freedom to *restrict use of your scholarship*? I'm guessing that Morrison's going to continue to be a lonely voice on this since, as far as I can tell, she's dead wrong.

Licence restrictions: A fool's errand

That's John Wilbanks in a March 28, 2013 comment at *Nature* (the comment is freely available), and maybe the title is all you need. Or perhaps the tease: "Objections to the Creative Commons attribution licence are straw men raised by parties who want open access to be as closed as possible, warns John Wilbanks."

Wilbanks isn't directly addressing Morrison; he's responding to publishers who are fretting about CC-BY. But in the process, he does an excellent job of dealing with the supposed problems with CC-BY, while making it clear that CC-BY is *the most appropriate* license for OA materials and the tightest one that meets the BBB definitions. And, to be sure, *CC licenses exist* and are carefully written.

The commentary struck me as calm, carefully written and nicely done. I was a little astonished by the first comment, by Robert Dingwall, who begins "This is just typical of the arrogance of some OA evangelists" and, near the end, calls it a "rant." The very next comment offers *excellent* examples of why ND and NC clauses undermine OA.

The Gold and the Green

Not surprisingly, discussion and argumentation continues over the relative merits of Gold OA and Green OA—and whether there really should be a third color, Platinum OA, reserved for OA journals that have *neither* APCs nor subscription prices.

Key points these days:

➢ On the gold side, APCs—author-side charges—are problematic. That's especially true at the exalted levels asked by traditional publishers and some of the larger OA journals.

➢ On the green side, embargoes are problematic, no matter how short. It's not open acess if it's not accessible.

➢ Also on the green side are tricky elements of equity (when there are significant differences between the manuscript in the repository and the published version).

Some recent items in this area (that didn't fit better elsewhere) follow.

Why Author Pays Open Access is a Bad Idea

That's from Peter Wolf on October 20, 2012 at *Not Even Wrong*—but I didn't pick it up in time for the last roundup. He's a mathematician, not a logician, given that his case consists of a single anecdote. To wit, a "mathematics research paper" generated by Mathgen (one of those random-research-paper generators) was accepted by one of Scientific Research Publishing's journals. That's the anecdote. Here's the conclusion:

> These journals charge authors $500 to publish their papers, something which is now being sold as a wonderful mechanism for providing "open access" to the scientific literature. At the same time they make very clear what one big problem with this is: the financial incentive for the journal becomes to publish as many papers as possible, since that's the only way to increase revenue. Scientific Research Publishing does a good job of showing where this model for funding dissemination of academic research leads.

That's it. Period. The whole thing. That this particular issue has been addressed, repeatedly, is probably outside Wolf's awareness. The *exact same incentive* applies to subscription journals—both because a higher percentage of them charge author-side fees (they're not called APCs, but they're fees) than do Gold OA journals and because the standard justification for increased subscription prices is that the journals are publishing more papers. Oh, and as to having automatically generated bullshit accepted: That's happened in subscription journals as well. (If you want a current example of what Mathgen does, I refer you to "Positivity Methods in Non-Standard Lie Theory" by W. Crawford, S. Abram, D. Salo and B. Fister.)

There were quite a few comments—50 as of this writing. The first commenter says this mostly isn't a real problem—and Wolf responds with an odd argument: "Under the old libraries pay, costs everybody more to print more papers model, there was a strong incentive to keep numbers of papers published small, and quality high. If quality went down, librarians would start canceling." That *might* have

been true before the Big Bundle and when there were few enough journals that libraries could evaluate the quality of each one on an ongoing basis. (I'm not sure there was ever such a time, but never mind.) It's questionable whether that's true now; certainly the burgeoning number of articles and journals suggest otherwise. (Another commenter makes much that point.)

The odd thing is that Wolf agrees the current system is broken—but he goes out of his way to attempt to undermine an alternative based on one anecdote and a flawed generalization. The discussion continues, with Wolf showing a remarkable stubbornness in the face of history and facts, and even an unwillingness to distinguish among OA journals.

Maybe a good time to repeat the reality: *Most* Gold OA journals do *not* charge APCs. In mathematics, that's apparently true for about 60% of OA journals (based on one study of a few thousand OA journals), but in some fields it's much higher (e.g., 87% of social sciences OA journals and 80% of arts & humanities OA journals don't charge APCs). Not surprisingly, biomedicine is an outlier: The lowest no-fee percentage of any field reported, but still a bare majority not charging APCs.

On Opposition to *any* APC model

This January 13, 2013 post by Martin P. Eve on *DR MARTIN PAUL EVE* is related directly to the proposed humanities & social science megajournal discussed in the "Rest of Us" section of this roundup—near the end—but it's specific to a general aspect of Gold OA: author-side fees (APCs). Eve, who seems to be spearheading this project, got pushback on APCs from somebody who claimed that any form of APC was unacceptable and that all (journals with) APCs would be viewed as vanity publications.

It's a short response (and Eve's blog carries a CC BY license), so I'm going to quote the whole thing, then add comments:

> I think the "vanity publishing" argument is totally fallacious; it's clear that the review process would be completed utterly independently well before any consideration of finance would be made. You'll get your accept/reject email on the basis of the article, then we can talk money. Sure, there are predatory OA journals on the APC model. I hold that the current model is wholly predatory, though, when based on subscriptions, so pick the lesser of two evils and trust (when we have the requisite respected academic capital at the top) that we'll do things right.

> Furthermore, as I said by email to the commenter, I have long held an opposition to author pays models

(see any of my publications and also my own journals). However, I have come to conclude that, at a practical, extreme high-volume model (such as that operated by PLOS), there is no way that freely given/volunteered labour can cover all the necessary tasks in a fair manner that will pose a serious threat to the existing model. In fact, it might be ethically dubious (under the pragmatic conciliations we must make to the capitalist system) to expect this to be undertaken without some form of recompense. There *is* labour involved in publication; it's not as much as publishers claim, but it is still work and people need to eat.

> The compromise that I am willing to make on this front is to establish a strictly non-profit organization that will waive any APCs on request. In short: we will operate on a goodwill model that purely sustains the cost of employing a low number of staff on a permanent basis to undertake the publishing side of the work. My eventual plan/hope is that if enough institutions subscribe on bulk (to waive fees for their researchers), we can then waive all author fees once costs are covered.

As to the second objection ("vanity publishing," which Eve treats first), at this point I regard any such suggestion as the worst form of anti-OA bullshit. ("Totally fallacious" is a far more polite way to say this.) And I rather love Eve's flipping of the "predatory publisher" argument—it's increasingly clear that the true predators are the traditional publishers, especially as they attempt to subvert OA for their own profit.

The rest seems sound to me. I believe some APCs are excessive, including some for high-profile new all-OA publishers—but *if* a megajournal makes sense, *then* some level of author-side funding is probably needed. I suspect that, in the humanities and social sciences, that "if" clause deserves a good deal more discussion than the "then" clause, assuming that the proposed APCs are rational (e.g., in the two-digit or low three-digit area).

Why I've joined the bad guys

Timothy Gowers posted this piece on January 14, 2013 at *Gowers's Weblog*. "The bad guys" in this case is the new *Forum of Mathematics* from Cambridge University Press, a Gold OA journal that will *eventually* have APCs "set at a rate justified by real publishing costs." (CUP is waiving the charges for the first three years; Gowers says the APC after that will be £500.) It is, in part at least, a response to "Worse than Elsevier," posted on September 27, 2012 by Orr Shalit at *Noncommutative Analysis*. Shalit's arguments against APCs are similar to Wolf's albeit at greater lengths, including this little gem:

These journals always seemed to me to be a nasty way to wring money out of mathematicians that either don't know better, don't believe in their own worth, or couldn't (for some reason) publish their work in a normal journal.

Whew. (Shalit is one of those who believes [a] that posting on the web equals publication and {b} therefore "all papers are open access anyway.")

Gowers responds at some length—just under 4,000 words, or about 2/3 as long as this roundup up to here. A few excerpts from a long, careful discussion:

Let me begin with the "it is just plain wrong" part. A number of people have said that they find APCs morally repugnant. However, that on its own is not an argument. It reminds me of some objections to stem cell research. Many people feel that that is wrong, regardless of any benefits that it might bring. Usually their objections are on religious grounds, though I imagine that even some non-religious people just feel instinctively that stem-cell research is wrong. In the case of APCs, I very much doubt that there is a religious objection, so I think everybody can agree that merely saying, "I find the idea horrible," is not an argument until one has given a reason for its being horrible…

Actually, I myself very strongly agree with the assertion that it is wrong for authors to pay to have their articles published. Why? The main one is that it gives an advantage to rich authors. When we judge the research output of other mathematicians, we pay some attention to the quality of the journals that they have published in. If it turned out that rich mathematicians could publish in better journals than poor mathematicians, we would be introducing a completely irrelevant criterion, wealth, when all that should matter is the quality of the mathematics. The fact that it would be giving an advantage to people who are already advantaged makes things even worse.

So what am I doing on the editorial board of a journal that will in due course have article processing charges? There is no inconsistency here, because *authors will not pay to publish in Forum of Mathematics.*

[Summarizing: APCs are article processing charges, not author fees, and the editors do not "under any circumstances expect authors to meet APCs out of their own pockets. Then notes that APCs don't come into discussion until an article is accepted.]

If your article is accepted, and if your institution is set up to meet APCs (as an increasing number of institutions already are) or they are covered by a grant that you are on, then you will arrange for your APC to be paid. Otherwise, CUP will ask for a

letter from your institution stating that they are unwilling to pay the charge. No justification for this is required—just confirmation that it is the case. If you are not affiliated with an institution, then the charge will be automatically waived….

What??!! How can it cost £500 to process an article?

There are two questions here. One is whether £500 will be a fair reflection of the costs that CUP will incur when processing Forum articles. The other is whether what they provide for those costs is worth paying for. The first question has a simple answer: it will. The answer to the second question is much less obvious, for which reason I want to postpone discussing it until the part of this post that will deal with the more serious objections to Forum of Mathematics.

So how can the costs reach anything like £500? I'll talk in general terms here, and not specifically about Forum of Mathematics. There are many things that an academic journal does to a paper once it has gone through the refereeing process and been accepted. It does copy-editing, typesetting, addition of metadata, and making sure the article appears on various bibliographic databases. (I repeat that in this section I am not discussing whether we want all these things.) A typical cost for all this is around $20 per page. That's just a fact: if you go round and ask people who work for conventional maths journals what it costs them per page to process an article, that is the kind of figure you will get.

At this point, you can do some calculations yourself. If an average article is 25 pages, that's already $500, which is approximately the same order of magnitude as £500. Then you have to take into account a number of other factors, such as that it costs money to handle papers that are then rejected (not all that much, but even arXiv needs $7 per paper), and there will probably be several of those per accepted paper, that fees will be waived for some articles, that there will be staff costs and overheads (such as part of the cost of heating the building used by the staff — things like that), and so on.

For that kind of reason, it is a straightforward empirical fact that £500 is the right order of magnitude for the costs per article incurred by a journal that operates in roughly the same way as a current conventional print journal.

I like this brief but reasonably coherent justification for an APC that's cheap by biomed terms but higher than many others charge. I'm omitting the fascinating discussion of the assertion that Forum of Mathematics is "even worse than Elsevier" because you need to read it in the original. Please do so.

Authors are doing a service to the world, so making them pay is ridiculous.

First, let me repeat that authors will not pay to publish in FoM. But let's think about what the service is that authors do to the world. In some cases, they prove results that fascinate other mathematicians and stimulate a great deal of further research. That is undoubtedly doing a service. But that service is already done the moment they put their paper on the arXiv or their home page (assuming they do). So why do they bother to publish?

Another good discussion follows that you might better read in the original. Gowers goes on to discuss whether the APC involves *needed* costs—and that's a complex, rich discussion that I'm not willing to summarize, having to do with paths to new systems and other things. He also addresses the "radical change" position—people who don't want traditional-style journals with APCs—and says he basically agrees, and that gets into transition again. Oh, and bundling. Gowers doesn't like the effects of bundling: Good for him.

Now that I've managed to refer you back to the original for most of what Gower has to say, I'm going to cite his list of safeguards offered as an answer to those who say that the new journal "indirectly confers legitimacy on many journals with much worse policies":

1. Editorial decisions should be completely independent of financial considerations. If the editors decide that a paper is good enough to be accepted, then it will be published. Ideally, editors should not know, when they handle a paper, whether the author has access to funds for article processing charges. [I say "ideally" simply because there will be situations where an author's institution's policy is known to an editor. For example, it seems that in the UK, as a result of government mandates, all universities will be obliged to have a pot of money for paying APCs, and an editor may well know that an author is British.]

2. Under no circumstances should there ever be any advantage to an author who is happy to pay an article processing charge out of his/her own pocket.

3. An author at an institution that is willing to pay article processing charges should not be at any advantage over an author at an institution that is not willing to pay article processing charges.

4. The article processing charges should be set at the level needed to cover reasonable costs of the publisher (including overheads and possibly a modest profit for the purposes of reinvestment).

A long, long stream of comments—many of them informative, relatively few of them outright combative (or at least uninformedly combative).

Open Access and the Author-Pays Problem…

That's the first portion of the title of this commentary paper by A. Townsend Peterson, Ada Emmett and Marc L. Greenberg in the *Journal of Librarianship and Scholarly Communication* (Volume 1, Issue 3, 2013). The remainder: "Assuring Access for Readers *and* Authors in the Global Academic Community."

The piece frequently refers to "authors paying fees," an unfortunate choice, even if it does explain that more than 70% of Gold OA journals don't *charge* APCs. Much of it reads as an attack on the Finch report and a support of Green OA over Gold. There is an interesting discussion of APC waivers, suggesting that APCs raise a *psychological* barrier that makes waivers irrelevant.

I believe these are the key paragraphs of what the authors are proposing. (Because of the fun of copying-and-pasting from some PDFs, any emphases in the original have been lost.)

Although author-pays journals may play a role in the interim, a key medium-to-long-term solution is to subsidize non-commercial academic publishing more fundamentally to ensure effective global communication. Experiments along these lines, some very successful, are already underway: libraries and universities are developing robust digital publishing support units (Mullins et al., 2012), including the newly announced all-OA university press at Amherst College (https://www.amherst.edu/library/press/news); institutions are offering funding support to OA journals (see, e.g., COPE, http://www. oacompact.org); institutions and research funders are exploring means of opening access to scholarship regardless of journal policies (e.g., NIH and Wellcome Trust, as discussed above); funders are sponsoring OA journals (e.g., eLife); as well as more controversial programs to support OA as recommended in the Finch Report ….

A longer-term solution would involve redirecting the massive funds currently dedicated to pay-for-access fees to subsidize academic publishing directly, without profiteering intermediaries. Over 50% of academic libraries surveyed in the US indicated either having or planning a scholarly publishing service (Mullins et al., 2012, p. 6). For example, 50 US university libraries are collaborating with Educopia Institute, http://www.educopia.org/programs/lpc, to establish the Library Publishing Coalition.

The proposals are at least interesting (and the commentary's worth reading), although the "massive funds" currently dedicated to subscriptions to commercial journals far outweigh, probably by an order or two of magnitude, anything actually *being paid* for APCs in Gold OA journals at this point. I'm

all in favor of libraries becoming journal publishers; of course, that's easy for me to say…

Not explicitly discussed

I tagged Richard Poynder's "Tale of Two Tables" and the *D-Lib* article "Planting the Green Seeds for a Golden Harvest" (by Houghton and Swan) for discussion…but I'm not going to discuss either one. They're easy enough to find. Both have a pronounced "green is better" bias and both seem to ignore the fact—*fact*—that roughly three-quarters of Gold OA journals (publishing roughly half of Gold OA articles) charge $0 APCs. They're there if you want to read them. (OK, so there are *hundreds* if not thousands of posts and articles by folks like Harnad and Morrison and the chefs at one ill-favored kitchen that I'm *also* not discussing; these two are ones that I think might be worth reading, but choose not to discuss. There is a difference.)

Amidst a 'Revolution,' Publishers Are Told, Know Your 'End Users'

Jennifer Howard wrote this on February 11, 2013 at *The Chronicle of Higher Education*'s Wired Campus blog—and Howard's clearly a good reporter and good writer, so I'm willing to believe her report on the AAP/PSP annual meeting. I want to point out a gem or two, such as this one quoting Blaise Simqu of SAGE Publications:

> In his opinion, Mr. Simqu said, "open access is a burden on the individual researcher," who often has to find money to cover some publication costs, like article-processing fees. Meanwhile, "the faculty has very much decided they don't want to pay for information" anymore.

The CEO of the American Chemical Society was upfront about what publishing means to ACS: Profit, profit, profit. "Some 92 percent of the society's revenue comes from publishing, she said." I find that outrageous, but that's just me.

And then there's this:

> A very different glimpse of a researcher-driven publishing future came from Randy Schekman, editor in chief of *eLife*, a new journal. Mr. Schekman, a professor of molecular and cell biology at the University of California at Berkeley, described the journal's emphasis on streamlining and speeding up the submission-and-review process. There's a pervasive feeling among researchers that "it simply takes too much time for one's most important work to be published," Mr. Schekman said. Authors who submit papers to *eLife* can expect to hear back quickly, he said, and the average time from submission to acceptance is only 60 days.

> Mr. Schekman faced a few tough questions about whether the journal's financial backers—the Wellcome Trust, the Howard Hughes Medical Institute, and the Max Planck Institute—might exercise undue influence over what it publishes. "The funding organizations have no say whatsoever in our editorial decisions," he responded.

I'll skip over the "suggestions" of impropriety from certain sources, but I'm guessing editors of Elsevier or ACS journals rarely face "tough questions" about whether the parent organizations have "undue influence" over what's published. I'm guessing that's reserved for nonprofit Gold OA publishers

The last comment (quoted here) from Simqu was directly addressed by the first two commenters, both of whom say, in essence, "nonsense." What some academics *are* saying is that there's no excuse for paying as much as they have been. As Billy Meinke puts it: "Advancements in information technology, however, have reduced the cost of and increased the speed at which we can share the results of research and provide alternative metrics to measure impact and quality of research, which are not mentioned in this article. This is worrisome."

CORE: Three Access Levels to Underpin Open Access

Moving along the spectrum into the green portion, I'm noting this article by Petr Knoth and Zdenek Zdrahal in the November/December 2012 *D-LIB Magazine*, although I won't be discussing it at length.

Briefly, CORE is designed as a repository aggregator to go beyond systems such as Oasis to provide other forms of functionality. Here's the abstract:

> The last 10 years have seen a massive increase in the amount of Open Access publications in journals and institutional repositories. The open availability of large volumes of state-of-the-art knowledge online has the potential to provide huge savings and benefits in many fields. However, in order to fully leverage this knowledge, it is necessary to develop systems that (a) make it easy for users to discover and access this knowledge at the level of individual resources, (b) explore and analyse this knowledge at the level of collections of resources and (c) provide infrastructure and access to raw data in order to lower the barriers to the research and development of systems and services on top of this knowledge. In this paper, we argue why these requirements should be satisfied and show that current systems do not meet them. Consequently, we present the CORE (COnnecting REpositories) system, a large-scale Open Access aggregation, outlining its existing functionality and discussing the future technical devel-

opment. We demonstrate how the system addresses the above needs and how it can be applied to the benefit of the whole ecosystem that includes institutional repositories, individuals, researchers, developers, funding bodies and governments.

I'd include a link to CORE, but the nature of the project means there are several links, all of them in Part 4 of the article. Well worth reading if you're interested in how repositories—the heart of Green OA—can interoperate effectively.

All Green-OA embargoes are iniquitous

That's Mike Taylor on March 15, 2013 at *Sauropod Vertebra Picture of the Week*, noting that the boldface in this subsection heading substitutes for italics in the post title. Here's a green-side discussion of the RCUK dustup and the length of allowed embargoes.

> The truth here is terribly simple. There is no justification for embargoes of any length on accepted manuscripts, ever. Remember that, whatever else they do, publishers do not fund research, nor peer-review. Up to the point where a manuscript is accepted for publication, they have made no contribution, and it's nothing short of an outrage that current policies allow them *any* say in what happens to the work that has been done to that point.

Taylor describes the post-acceptance publication process, the point at which publishers presumably add value (since, as he says, they don't *do* the peer review). But all of that value comes *after* the paper has been accepted—and it's the accepted paper that's normally deposited for green OA. Therefore, since the publisher adds no value before that point…

> Any publisher that argues against this policy is saying that the value they add is inadequate. Under a zero-embargo system, libraries would still subscribe to journals if they felt that the value added by publishers was worth what they charge for subscriptions. Publishers that do a good job at a good price would not be harmed. The only publishers that could conceivably suffer under such a policy are incompetent or exploitative ones. When did it become the government's job to protect them?

Seems like a straightforward argument to me. The few comments are interesting.

Can repositories solve the access problem?

Mike Taylor again, same *SVPotW* blog, a little earlier (March 2, 2013). This is a moderately long and very well-stated discussion of what he sees as weaknesses in Green OA. I find it interesting that in the preface he says that pushback against the RCUK favoritism of Gold OA comes "particularly from humanities scholars," but that's irrelevant (and he's probably

right). As always, the blog is CC BY so I could legitimately quote the whole thing…but I won't.

Taylor's major points, discussed in some detail:

➤ Green OA creates a two-class system in two ways. First, it creates two classes of papers—the author's draft and the final version. Second, it thus creates two classes of readers and researchers, with only the privileged few having access to the "proper" papers.

➤ It retains the expense of continuing subscriptions. "I find it baffling that people keep talking as though Green OA is cheaper than Gold. It isn't, at all…"

➤ Embargoes are bad (as discussed in the later post, which appears above).

➤ Green OA seems to result in more restrictive licenses than Gold OA, and "this just won't do. It's not open access… Non-commercial licences impede the use of research, and that's not to the benefit of wider society."

➤ Practical failings—of which there are quite a few, too many to list here.

It's a good piece, worth reading; there's a *lot* more detail than I've offered here. There are also 29 comments to date, including a Harnad megacomment—fortunately, not early enough to stifle other discussion. I cited this version rather than the same piece appearing under a slightly different title at the *Impact of Social Sciences* blog because that version is immediately followed by a long, long, long Harnad screed that shut down most other comments, apparently.

How institutional repositories are already working to solve the Open Access problem

This March 14, 2013 post by Natalia Madjarevic, Dave Puplett and Neil Stewart at London School of Economics' *Impact of Social Sciences* blog is intended to respond to Taylor's piece in its incarnation on that blog. The three authors are librarians and IR managers in UK institutions.

> Self-deposit in a repository was not, as many repository advocates would agree, designed as a complete, permanent solution to achieving universal Open Access. It is however an excellent transitional route for individuals, institutions and disciplines to take. It is this message about transition that has been so often lost in Green v Gold debates, a mistake that is being repeated in the post-Finch discussions. We would like to restate the case for what IRs can do for academics and their research, and to respond to some of Mike's specific concerns about Green OA. The responses correspond to each of Mike's five concerns.

The response to the first is that authors "can and should do the editorial work to make the green OA version reflect the published version as best as possible," which is, unfortunately, a handwave: Authors *cannot* do that without the publisher's permission in many cases.

As to the second, the writers' discussion includes the implicit assumption that Gold OA automatically means paying to publish; otherwise, it's the "eventually, things *should* get cheaper" argument. And yet it isn't really: "As a transitional tool Green OA has already begun to work, and it can do a lot more before it could begin to seriously threaten the business models of most publishing services." In other words, *those subscription costs won't go down*, and that's a *feature* of Green OA—that it doesn't threaten publishers.

Embargoes? Another handwave. Simply not an answer, except that the writers agree that embargoes are bad…and state with pride that IRs are set up to handle embargoes.

Licenses? Yet another handwave, I'm afraid, based on the ground-up development of IRs.

As to practical failings, that's an interesting discussion, much of which boils down to "Gold OA isn't perfect either."

But I may be reading the piece too harshly—after all, I'd just encountered a double-dose of Harnad. I'll just quote the conclusion:

> IRs are working. They do the jobs they set out to do: enabling a cost-effective long term transition from Green to Gold OA, enhanced search engine visibility for research, and providing consistent metadata – all evidence points to mature systems with an important role to play. IRs also provide additional services such as collecting, sharing and preserving collections such as theses, grey literature and research data. They also contextualise research outputs in unique ways: for example, acting as a record of an institution's research output alongside quantitative data such as download statistics. IRs are much more than "just" databases for Green OA journal articles.

> Mike's post proves there are reservations about the capability of IRs in providing a complete solution for comprehensive OA, though we have argued that this is not necessarily what IRs are there to do. They are, however, accusations with some weight, and for us this raises the point: if we IR-types are already developing solutions that address many of these issues, we need to make sure people know about them and the services IRs provide. Although IR content is highly visible in search engine results, institutions themselves must make IRs highly visible, user friendly

and embedded across their online presence. Innovative systems will lead to increased scholarly engagement and improve the likelihood that Green OA via IRs are a positive solution in an upside-down system.

But but but…Taylor was not attacking IRs (except to the extent that they don't work well). He was saying they're not robust OA solutions. Yes, IRs are much more than Green OA repositories—but, actually, not a word in the article makes a case that IRs "enable a cost-effective long term transition from Green to Gold OA." Indeed, the article explicitly says that it would be a long time before Green OA would "seriously threaten the business model of most publishing services." There, there, Elsevier: Green OA doesn't threaten your profits!

I certainly agree with the second paragraph. IRs need to be better used and better understood. Which is a whole different set of discussions.

And that's the end of the direct "colors" section. Related issues will, of course, arise later.

A Few Historical Items

This is an odd little group where I have relatively few comments, so let's go through all five as one set of bullet points:

➢ Colin Macilwain asks "Is Open Access Finally on the Ascendancy?" in the January 2013 *Bio-Science* (available here from SPARC). It's a quick overview of the current situation; although I think the piece pretty clearly means to say "No" to the question, it's not a terrible discussion.

➢ Caitlin Rivers' "Scholarly Impact of Open Access Journals," posted—well, it's not clear *when* it was posted, since there's no date—at Rivers' blog—is an odd one indeed. It refers to another post asking "why does interest in open access seem to be declining" based on *web search statistics*—and on a comparison with "open source" as a search topic. My immediate question would be "why would general web search numbers be of any use in determining interest?" but I know better than to ask questions like that. The newer post at least accepts the possibility that the "effect" Rivers claims to observe isn't real. There follow a bunch of graphs showing that OA journals are growing in number, with most all of them non-fee; that America has the most OA journals (and the most subscription journals, to be sure); and that OA journals have lower "impact" based on one traditional impact metric than subscription journals—but the gap may be closing. For what it's

worth, she seems to show that OA journals from "the big 4" (US, UK, Netherlands, Germany) have almost caught up with subscription journals in median impact. The closing question—"How do we [improve] the trend, and bring open access into the mainstream?"—begs the question, as nothing here says that OA isn't *in* the mainstream.

➢ Not really about OA directly, and very short, but cute: "The future of science publishing from 1996," posted January 11, 2013 by Neil Saunders at *What You're Doing Is Rather Desperate*. While noting that Gold OA journals (not called that) go back at least eight years before 1996, it's still an interesting link worth reading.

➢ More substantive is "A Look Back at 23 Years as an Open Access Publisher" by Charles W. Bailey, Jr., published in 2012. Bailey's involvement with OA began essentially at the same time as mine did and in the same manner: *The Public-Access Computer Systems Review*, one of the first OA journals and the first in LIS. He launched it; I wrote for it, served on the editorial board, and formatted four annual print versions. The 12-page PDF is an impressive, mostly list-based, look.

➢ Finally (and belatedly, since it was published June 13, 2011), there's "The Development of Open Access Journal Publishing from 1993 to 2009" by Laakso, Welling, Bukvova, Nyman, Bjork and Hedlund, which appeared in *PLoS ONE*. The title describe it, and from what I can see it's well-done, including some references to the pre-1993 scene based largely on my own 2001 study of *really* early OA journals. Worth reading for background on Gold OA during the 17-year period.

Problems

A catchall for a variety of problematic discussions not covered elsewhere.

Open Access from a Publisher's Perspective

This editorial by Dr. Alicia Wise appears in the January 2013 issue of *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*—and, unlike refereed articles in that Elsevier journal, it's openly available. It's also classic Elsevier:

> Elsevier, along with many other publishers, is comfortable with open-access approaches, where provided these methods are economically sustainable for all stakeholders. Elsevier has always supported business models that help researchers communicate and access information in a sustainable way. Ten million researchers from 120 countries use Elsevier's platforms each month. 85% of researchers have access to this platform, including researchers in 105 low-and-middle-income countries through the Research4Life program. But access is important to others, too, which is why we provide a wide array of programs to enable access by members of the public, and by businesses both big and small. We already use all kinds of open access models too. For example, Elsevier has 31 open access journal titles and more than 1500 of our journals offer authors the option to make their article open access (additional information about each of these programs is online at http://www.elsevier.com/about/open-access/open-access-options). [Emphasis added.]

The boldfaced text is critical, since it means "as long as Elsevier continues to show extremely high profits." The next is bafflegab—because millions of researchers have access to Elsevier articles, we should pretty much ignore all of those who do not. As for the "option," it's almost never taken up—for a simple reason, mostly price. *JAL* charges a cool $3,000 APC, an astonishing amount for a librarianship journal. (It could be worse. Some of Elsevier's Gold OA journals charge as much as $5,000. For which, incidentally, you do *not* get full libre OA—Elsevier's terms still prohibit commercial reuse.) As far as I can tell, *JAL* costs $440/year for a print subscription (6 issues); beyond that, pricing is difficult for me to find or decipher.

You can read the original editorial. It's not long.

It's probably worth nothing that *JAL* was possibly the first librarianship journal to experience what the Open Access Directory calls a "journal declaration of independence," in which all or most of the editorial board resigns and launches a competitive journal with a friendlier publisher. For *JAL* it happened in 1998 and resulted in *Portal* (which is also a subscription journal and hides even editorial statements behind a paywall). It's easy to confuse *JAL* with *JLA*, the *Journal of Library Administration*, which has just experienced a journal declaration of independence as I write this (*JLA* is a Taylor & Francis journal with similarly outrageous APCs, albeit a whole $5 cheaper at $2,995), although so far the editorial board hasn't founded a new journal. If they do, it's only fair to assume that—unlike *Portal*—it will be online-only and Gold OA from the start. (Since *Library Leadership & Management*, the peer-reviewed journal of ALA's Library Leadership and Management Association, LLAMA, is *already* a no-fee Gold OA journal using CC BY as a license, there may or may not be a need.)

The OA Interviews: Ashry Aly of Ashdin Publishing
This piece is by Richard Poynder and was [posted January 17, 2013](#) at *Open and Shut?* To some extent, it deals with the question "What makes a publisher predatory?" and "Is Jeffrey Beall a plausible guardian of journal publishing ethics?" Especially in his most recent list, increasing the number of claimed predatory publishing by nearly an order of magnitude (from 23 in 2012 to 225 in 2013), Beall has painted "predatory" OA with a *very* wide brush.

At the same time, Beall *has* documented a number of publishers or pseudopublishers that do appear to be APC mills, grabbing relatively low processing fees and spamming researchers to submit articles in scores or hundreds of new journals, some of which may never see articles. Beall was also the subject of some truly underhanded attacks—claims that he was blackmailing publishers.

Some claims of Beall's blackmail appear to come from Ashry Aly, who used to work at Hindawi but left in 2007 to form Ashdin Publishing. And Poynder's long introductory essay includes some good notes on one aspect of supposed predatory publishers, e.g.:

> We are…bound to ask: is there a danger that some in the West are susceptible (if only unconsciously) to prejudice when considering the merits of publishers based in the developing-world?

> There is no doubt that some of the OA publishers that have emerged in the developing world in recent years can accurately be described as "predatory," and many of these publishers are on Beall's list. It also seems highly likely that the majority of the unscrupulous OA publishers operating today are based in the developing world.

> But we need also to remind ourselves that some of the OA publishers based in the developing world seem to be driven by entirely honourable motives, and appear to be as ethical as any in the West. They also seem keen to develop world-class OA journals. A good example is Hindawi, which at one time featured on Beall's list (as did its ISRN), before disappearing from it without explanation.

> Might we be arriving at a point where any publisher based in the developing world is automatically assumed to be unscrupulous, if not downright predatory?

The ellipse replaces "therefore" referring to reactions to the new and, in my mind, *very* questionable [OAJPA](#), the Open Access Journal Publishers Association, an odd "organization" apparently in India that seems likely to be confused with [OASPA](#), the Open Access Scholarly Publishers Association, which has been around for a few years and has established a reasonably good reputation (although OASPA also seems somewhat toothless: ideally, OASPA should be doing what Beall claims to do).

You may or may not find the interview worthwhile. Early on, Aly says "the [Gold OA] model generally assumes that authors pay a fee to publish their papers," which is *simply not true* for roughly three-quarters of Gold OA journals. Basically, Aly's pitch is lower (but still present!) APCs—in the €100 to €300 range. (Actually, the top of that range comes awfully close to $400, so it's not *that* much lower than the bottom of Aly's claimed range for other publishers, that is, $500. But Aly claims the top will be falling to €200, which is significantly lower.) Aly's company is another many-journals/few-papers situation: at the time of the interview, 29 journals with a total of 401 articles, with plans to launch *even more* journals. To make things more interesting, Aly's journals offer print subscriptions--€199 for all of the articles bundled up into one print annual. If the journals use a CC-BY license, which Aly says they do, I'd guess somebody else could do that bundling, offer the results through Lulu, and earn a decent profit while charging less: After all, €199 at this writing is $258 or so, and at $4.50 plus $0.02/page, that would cover one heck of a big annual volume. (A 700-page annual, about the biggest Lulu will handle, would cost $18.50. Even done full-color, a 700-page annual would come in under $150.)

Aly continues to assert that Beall sent him email asking for $5,000 to re-evaluate the publishing company. Beall responded to portions of the interview [in a blog post](#)—*not* denying that the blackmail came from his email account but asserting (reasonably, given my own experience) that he was "the victim of criminal impersonation"—email spoofing in order to commit a criminal act (which solicitation of blackmail would appear to be). Since Aly's only evidence that Beall himself *did* send the email is the address, this seems like a solid response. Is Aly's company predatory? That's harder to say. Beall's chief complaint appears to be instances of plagiarism in individual articles and failure to retract those articles when notified of such plagiarism. (*No* publisher can avoid articles with plagiarism: That's essentially impossible.)

It's tricky. Want to see *how* tricky it is? [Here's an article](#) (in an OA journal that's explicitly Marxist/leftist oriented) that can be read as suggesting that PLoS is a predatory publisher.

There's a long, long set of comments (not all that many, but some of them are essays) that may be informative. Or it may not.

Bogus New OA Publisher Association Attempts to Compete with OASPA

Speaking of Jeffrey Beall and OAJPA, here's Beall's January 9, 2013 post on the new association. The title may be all you need to know about Beall's judgment regarding OAJPA. He does go further—for example, accusing it of plagiarism for failing to credit Peter Suber for a copied section of text licensed as CC-BY (which is technically correct). It's a short item that concludes:

> Conclusion: To attract author fees, predatory publishers need to appear legitimate. The few publishers behind this bogus effort have created a false, industry self-regulation association. It is a dishonest attempt to add a mark of legitimacy to a bunch of predatory journals.

There are some comments. Beall did make one error (he says serials don't get ISBNs, and that's not always true), and he seems to be—no, he *is*—explicitly saying that all members of OAJPA are predatory.

It may be worth noting that Beall has published an article *in a toll-access journal* that attacks open access in general. For more, see the March 2003 *Current Cites,* the third entry. If Peter Hirtle's summary is at all fair to the article (I'm fairly sure it is; Hirtle doesn't make these things up), Beall is losing nearly all credibility. Frankly, any article that says the serials crisis was "essentially resolved" by 2004 must be from some parallel universe. (I'll have a *lot* more to say about that in *The Big Deal and the Damage Done*, out soon as an ebook with excerpts in the July 2013 *Cites & Insights*.)

The Real Costs of Publishing the Journal

This editorial by Norbert J. Pienta appears in the *Journal of Chemical Education* 90 (2), published online January 23, 2013. It is probably worth noting up front that this journal comes from ACS. You will not be surprised that in the opening paragraph Pienta offers the standard falsehood about Gold OA:

> Gold open access involves journals designed specifically to publish in this way, typically because publication costs are borne by the authors and their funding agencies.

There is no reality I am aware of in which "typically" can be used for "26% of cases."

We are informed that *JCE* and ACS "are still considering the open-access options." Meanwhile, Pienta wants to talk costs, including this interesting statement:

> Several aspects of journal publishing involve voluntary contributions: our authors send us their best ide-

as and the descriptions of that scholarly work put into practice, reviewers provide commentary about the value or worth of the author's contributions, and editors decide what gets accepted and how the content is presented. These critical components are not "free", although no money changes hands during these aspects of publishing. However, the review, production, and dissemination portions of *JCE* publication involve services and products that are purchased or leased.

The final sentence is relevant. The penultimate one does little but confuse the issue: Yes, those components *are* free from the publisher's perspective: "no money changes hands." So now we should get to the heart of the discussion—some *actual discussion of real costs*. Right?

Wrong.

We get a long paragraph about transitions and how wonderful *JCE*'s new copublisher (ACS) is. We get this: "All of these tools and services cost money and in some cases, substantially more than what was expended before the transitions in 2009." We get a sad story about reduced revenue from advertising *for the print version* and how much postage and handling costs. Details of the *actual* costs of "review, production, and dissemination"? Not there. The editorial boils down to "It's expensive. Trust me."

As these things go, *JCE* isn't particularly expensive *for individuals* or for students (and high school teachers): $50-$80 per year online, $65-$115 for individuals. Library and institutional access? Not quite so forthcoming.

A strikingly disappointing and even vapid defense—an editorial that does not actually offer, you know, "real costs" in discussing real costs.

> A note along the way: This section was going to include quotes from and comments on a commentary entitled "Fools' gold" at *Times Higher Education*. But *THE* now has a limited-views-per-month policy such that I can't go back and read the item unless, I guess, I wait a month. So it goes.

To Boycott or Not to Boycott

An odd one to finish off this little section—an editorial by Moshe Y. Vardi, editor-in-chief of *Communications of the ACM*, appearing March 1, 2013. You may find it more than a little difficult to read—as first presented, it's in very small light grey type that runs the full width of the page, as though challenging the reader's eyesight.

It's about the Elsevier boycott. Vardi doesn't like it.

> Frankly, I do not understand why Elsevier is practically the sole target of the recent wrath directed at scholarly publishers. Elsevier is no worse than most

other for-profit publishers, just bigger, I believe. Why boycott Elsevier and not Springer, for example? The argument made by some that "we must start somewhere" strikes me as plainly unfair and unjust.

So if you can't start everywhere you shouldn't start at all? An interesting argument that becomes bizarre if you apply it to other fields. But that's not all. Vardi pretty much calls the boycott *immoral*:

> …[T]he boycott petition also asks signatories to refrain from refereeing articles submitting to Elsevier journals. This means that if you sign this petition then, in effect, you are boycotting your colleagues who have disagreed with you and chose to submit their articles to an Elsevier journal.

> I believe in keeping science separate from politics. If it is legitimate to boycott publishing politics—the issue of open access is, after all, a political issue— why is it not legitimate to boycott for other political considerations? Is it legitimate to refrain from refereeing articles written by authors from countries with objectionable government behavior? Where do you draw the line to avoid politicizing science?

You can read the rest for yourself. Vardi seems to say that the only answer is for association publishers to "out-publish" for-profit publishers. Now, if association publishers barely covered costs that would be an interesting position. As it stands…well, see ACS. In fact, ACM is also a subscription publisher with restrictive copyright policies, as some comments make clear. What Vardi did *not* say in the editorial (but does admit to in the comment stream): He serves on Elsevier editorial boards.

General

These items are a miscellany, even more so than what comes before and after (I think of "after" in terms of what's happening now and what's likely to come, but that may be simplistic).

Values and Scholarship

I'm a little late to pick up on this February 23, 2012 essay by 11 research university provosts at *Inside Higher Ed*. The provosts are from places like UIUC, Michigan, Penn State and Wisconsin/Madison; in total, their institutions engage in "over $5.6 billion of funded research each year."

The essay came out in opposition to RWA, and it's still worth reading. It's a cautious essay that certainly doesn't come out wholeheartedly for OA, but it says good things. I'll quote one portion, "Some examples of how we might do more to influence campus behaviors":

- Encouraging faculty members to retain enough rights in their published intellectual property that they can share it with colleagues and students, deposit it in open access repositories, and repurpose it for future research.

- Ensuring that promotion and tenure review are flexible enough to recognize and reward new modes of communicating research outcomes.

- Ensuring that our own university presses and scholarly societies are creating models of scholarly publishing that unequivocally serve the research and educational goals of our universities, and/or the social goals of our communities.

- Encouraging libraries and faculty to work together to assess the value of purchased or licensed content, and the appropriate terms governing its use.

Open Access Versus Traditional Journal Pricing: Using a Simple 'Platform Market' Model to Understand Which Will Win (and Which Should)

I'll point you to this November 2012 article by McCabe, Snyder and Fagin, all economists, with the admission that I found it maddening for some of the same reasons I find much work by economists maddening.

"Should" in the view of economists is about "efficiency," period. Oh, and if the economists can simplify things by simply defining non-fee OA journals out of existence, so much the better.

The conclusions will scarcely be surprising: It wouldn't be "efficient" to have universal OA, but it would be "efficient" for there to be more than there is now. As for more detailed analysis, I just can't. Maybe you'll love it.

Cost-effectiveness of open access publications

This January 22, 2013 article by West, Bergstrom and Bergstrom is part of the Eigenfactor® Project (and boy, does that ® appear whenever the word is used). It's another case where I'll mostly refer you to the article—about tools to choose the most cost-effective publication based on "article influence"— with three comments.

First comment: Since the cost effectiveness is based on dividing article influence score by APC, it is *infinite* for the vast majority of OA journals— those that don't have APCs. Therefore, using the authors' own metric, scholars should *always* submit to non-fee Gold OA journals. That conclusion does not appear in the article.

Second comment: The sampling of journals used for the study is overweighted toward APC-charging OA journals: Of 985 journals considered, only 357 were non-fee journals.

Third comment: Look at Table 1 and Table 2 on page 15, respectively giving the top ten APC-based OA journals based on the authors' Cost Effectiveness ratio—and the top ten free (non-APC) gold OA journals ranked by AI score. Note that the AI scores for *all ten* of the free OA journals are higher than for the first six of the ten APC-charging journals (the bottom four, three from PLoS and one others, have higher AIs but also *very* high fees). If each of those free journals charged, say, $1 or $10 or even $100 per article as an APC, they would be *much* higher in CE than any of the top ten—but they're all free. (At $10, the lowest of the top 10 would have a CE of 223.7, where only one of the top 10 APC journals exceeds 8.0, and that one is 17.8.) To me, that's pretty convincing.

Teaching about Open Access Without Saying "Open Access"

Another "go look at this: you might find it interesting" item, this one by Jill Cirasella on March 14, 2013 at *Open Access @ CUNY*. I'm not entirely clear on why it's *so* desirable to teach OA without actually using the word, but her example—entirely about Green OA—is interesting. Maybe it's a useful approach.

The Real Reason Journal Articles Should Be Free

I link to any *Slashdot* item with mild misgivings, but this one—on March 1, 2013—does offer one set of semi-informed perspectives. I'll just quote the final paragraph, skipping over some stuff where I'm inclined to say "already happening" or "but don't forget…" or "but, well…":

> And that, in the end, is the real reason journal articles should be free. Not because the U.S. government is making it a condition for taxpayer-funded research, although that is a welcome development. But because there's no part of the process that should cost very much to begin with, if article authors and peer reviewers are already being paid by their employers. The last piece of the puzzle is that enough academics and faculty departments have to agree to confer "prestige" on articles published in open-access journals, equivalent to the level of prestige that they would accord for an article published in a traditional journal of the same quality. If they won't do that, then the old-guard journals will maintain their monopoly on conferring "prestige", and don't be surprised if journal prices keep growing to the point where even Harvard can't pay for them.

Why open access is better for scholarly societies

This one's by Stuart Shieber on January 29, 2013 at *The Occasional Pamphlet* (warning: Firefox, at least, will screw up printing pretty badly on this blog). It's a "heavily edited transcript" of a talk he gave at the Linguistic Society of America. Since one argument *against* Gold OA is that it would undermine scholarly societies (because some such societies—ahem, ACS, ahem—prop up their other activities by ~~ripping off libraries~~ relying on subscription revenue), it's an important perspective. He's focusing on small to medium scholarly societies, not the biggies, but the commentary applies. Shieber uses a CC BY license, so I could quote all of this, but he's a fine writer and it's longish, so I'll just note a couple of excerpts.

> I want to argue that there is a real threat that many scholarly societies accurately perceive in their publishing programs, but that we must be careful not to misdiagnose this problem. In fact, a general move to open access would be the *best* outcome for scholarly society publishers. If the entirety of journal publishing magically metamorphosed somehow to an open-access system, scholarly society publishers would be much better off. From a strategic point of view then, the best course of action for scholarly societies and for the faculty and researchers who support them would be to promote a shift to open access as widely and as quickly as possible…
>
> [Some *really good discussion* about complementarity and the pretty clear fact that nonprofit journls are a whole lot more cost-effective, including impact measures, than for-profit journals. Also on the monopolistic nature of journals and the bundled-journal access problem]
>
> I'll tell you a personal story. Some years ago, Harvard was one of the first universities to cancel the "big deal" with Elsevier. I don't want to pick on Elsevier. They're not bad people. They're a wonderful group of folks. Lots of the large publishers of journals work this way and it's not because they're evil or anything like that. I just mention the Elsevier case as a convenient story. Harvard was one of the first universities to cancel its "big deal" and went a la carte on the journals. In the School of Engineering and Applied Sciences, my own school, we had been subscribing to around 130 Elsevier journals in engineering and applied sciences as I recall. We took the opportunity to cancel about 100 of these journals, leaving something like 30 journals, hoping to recoup some costs. And we did. The first year we recouped about 20%. The following year the total cost was back where it had been before the cancellations, and it has increased steadily from there. From the library's point of view, you can't win by canceling journals, because the product is not the journal, it's the bundle. [Emphasis added.]
>
> [More excellent discussion—although I'm not sure I'd agree with Shieber that APCs are the preferable solution for OA. Given that preference, he does make the easy case that APCs are a lot cheaper than

the current situation. But here's where he sees a problem—a problem that arises *because* of APCs:]

As I said at the outset, there is a real worry that society publishers should have about the open-access APC market. But it's not that they'd be at a competitive disadvantage in that market; I think that they'd have a huge advantage. And it's important to remember that they're already at a huge disadvantage in the subscription journal market; *status quo is a failing strategy*. Rather the problem is this. Open-access journals are at a disadvantage in their competition for authors against subscription journals. That is, the problem arises *across the two markets*. When the only kind of journals are open-access journals, scholarly societies have the upper hand. When there are both kinds of journals in the market, both subscription journals and open-access journals, the open-access journals are at a competitive disadvantage because (from the author's point of view) publishing is free in a subscription journal. (Of course, it's not really free; it's just that the research libraries of the world are underwriting the very high $5,000 cost per article.) By contrast, in an open-access APC journal, the author personally could be out let's say $1,200 or $1,500 or whatever. This is a problem not just for scholarly societies but for all publishers exploring the possibility of going fee-based open access.

[More follows, especially about institutional commitments to support APCs. Also a set of suggested steps for societies unable or unwilling to convert immediately and entirely to Gold OA.]

To the extent that we can get a transition to a primarily open-access publishing system to happen, scholarly societies, their members, and the general public will all be much better off, which is a happy confluence of interest. Thank you very much.

The comments are also worth reading.

The parvenus

This post [on January 24, 2013](#) by Library Loon at *Gavia Libraria* is all about process and timing—specifically, the fact that a bunch of "newcomers" are talking about OA and in some cases seem to be opportunistic about it. She quotes [a tweet](#) from John Wilbanks about "Non profits, pundits barging in after ignoring movement for years." And she understands the frustration.

Some small still-reptilian segment of the Loon's avian brain absolutely rages when she sees parvenus grabbing spotlights, swallowing up the open-access discourse, sailing gaily into clear waters the Loon spent long dark painful years trying to clear the weeds and algae from…

Since I've never been much more than an observer in these waters—albeit an observer who's written

one book and three books' worth of material about the field and participated in it since 1989—I've never been in a position to rage. Still, yes, when a hotshot new pundit seems to set up as The Voice of OA, I can get a little hot under the collar.

And probably shouldn't. For, as the Loon says:

Here's the thing, though. The thing is, this sort of interaction is what happens when we're finally winning: winning mindshare, winning progress, winning allies. If we care to continue to win, we don't alienate the parvenus; we welcome them and do what we can to turn them into substantive contributors to—yes, even owners of—the movement.

Eyes on the prize. This is what happens when we're winning. To keep winning, we must suppress our annoyance—our justified, legitimate annoyance—and smile. This is unquestionably both unfair and difficult, but it remains much the best of the available options.

Yep. The Loon's wiser than I am. My small part: as I was writing this essay, I converted my blog—*retroactively*, because when you're moving in the right direction you can do that—from CC BY-NC to plain ol' CC BY. And sometime soon, I may make the switch for *Cites & Insights*. Both in the recognition that I'm not going to be The Person, and the best I can do is make my small contributions as open as possible.

The Elsevier boycott one year on

This [January 28, 2013 post](#) appears on *Gowers's Weblog* but it's a joint statement by many of the people who were early signers for the Cost of Knowledge statement. It's well worth reading. So are most of the comments, especially the signed ones. Here's the close:

We acknowledge that there are differing opinions about what an ideal publishing system would be like. In particular, the issue of article processing charges is a divisive one: some mathematicians are strongly opposed to them, while others think that there is no realistic alternative. We do not take a collective position on this, but we would point out that the debate is by no means confined to mathematicians: it has been going on in the Open Access community for many years. We note also that the advantages and disadvantages of article processing charges depend very much on the policies that journals have towards fee waivers: we strongly believe that editorial decisions should be independent of an author's access to appropriate funds, and that fee-waiver policies should be designed to ensure this.

To summarize, we believe that the boycott has been a success and should be continued. Further success will take time and effort, but there are simple steps

that we can all take: making our papers freely available, and supporting new and better publication models when they are set up.

Placing PLoS ONE in the appropriate evaluative context

There won't be a separate humor section in this roundup, but we're starting to veer close to that in this January 14, 2013 post by drugmonkey at *Drug-Monkey*. DM's heard the "too many papers" complaint about *PLoS ONE* (it published 23,468 papers in 2012) and finds it bemusing for several well-stated reasons. DM also responds to the "too high an acceptance rate!" complaint by quoting Conan Kornetsky with a more academic version of a tenet I've stated over the years: Peer review doesn't determine *whether* a paper gets published, only *where*. Kornetsky's more elegant version (from 1975):

> There are enough journals currently published that if the scientist perseveres through the various rewriting to meet style differences, he will eventually find a journal that will accept his work.

Yep. Some scholars will look again and decide that the paper isn't actually worth publishing; others will persevere until some fourth-tier journal does the job (or, at worst, *starting a new one*, quite possibly with the help of one of the Big Publishers).

Quite an interesting range of comments, including one attack on *PLoS ONE* for being *too* selective.

Open Access for the Deeply Confused

I had to include this February 26, 2013 post at *Science Groupie* by Tania Browne if only for its title.

> On Friday my Twitter feed was awash with scientists and academics both rejoicing and despairing. Two big announcements had been released from either side of the Atlantic regarding the complex issue of Open Access of scientific literature. There was enough talk of Green and Gold to make you feel like Bob Marley had never gone away, and enough back-story to confuse even a hardened devotee of Eastenders.

That's the start of a "very basic guide to Open Access for non-academics" that uses a paper on the evolution significance of nose hair development in moles as an exemplar. It's nicely done and amusingly written enough to read in the original, as the scientist realizes that acceptance by the *International Journal of Mole Studies* "would be living the dream, my friends" and the paper is more likely to wind up in *Nasal Hair Journal*. In which it is accepted. Followed by this subheading:

> Brilliant, you're published! So now's the part where you get rich, right?

You can imagine the response to that. Getting on into OA, Browne seems to suggest that the OA movement was begun by "some science organisations," which isn't the way I remember it, and makes a statement I could only wish was true: "The whole idea of open access in science is pretty uncontroversial."

Also perhaps unfortunate: In discussing Gold OA journal business models she says flatly that "The most common way, however, is for open access journals to require a fee from the author either when the paper is submitted, or when the paper is published after the peer review process." That's just wrong. (Need I say it again? Nearly three-quarters of all Gold OA journals *do not charge fees from the authors*.)

There then follows a US-vs-UK comparison that has a distinctly Harnadian ring to it. But never mind. It's a good piece despite its flaws. (The first comment notes what appears to be an *actual* paper on mole nose hairs—in a Gold OA journal.)

Comments…some labor over the assumed APC charges by Gold OA journals; one comment notes that most (or at least many) *non*-OA journals "charge authors a small fortune to publish"; and more.

Academic Publisher Unveils New Journal Which Prevents All Access To Its Content

This bit of humor is from "Sisyphos" on January 19, 2013 at *Fragments of Truth*. Set aside its unfortunate assumption that all Gold OA publishing involves author-side charges and we get to the good stuff—the announcement of *Facts of Life* at a press conference:

> Not all academic publishers agree with this approach. Else Beer, the CEO of the prominent academic publisher Elsebeer, has condemned the open access approach and is instead betting on a new line of closed-access journals. Beer unveiled the new closed-access journal "*Facts of Life*" at a press conference.
>
> > "We realize that there is a big push towards open access publishing in science, but few people think about the problems that come with open access. If everyone is able to access a scientific paper, it is far more likely that they will read the paper and perhaps even try to replicate the results. This is a huge problem for scientists who routinely publish irreproducible results, as well as for scientists who want to keep their tools and scientific methods secret."
>
> Unlike previous closed access journals in which articles are hidden behind a paywall and can be accessed after paying a fee, "*Facts of Life*" guarantees that nobody other than the author can access the published article. This allows scientists to include the article as a published paper on their CV and cite their work, without ever having to worry that someone else

might read the article. Beer expects that this new concept will be embraced by many researchers

There's a bit more, including plaudits from a "physician-scientist and poet" who has "experiments that cannot be replicated" and welcomes the new journal, since OA publishing would eventually require retraction of the manuscripts.

The first commenter takes the piece seriously. That happens.

Historical note: Back in the day, one of the papers presented at LITA's Fuzzy Match Interest Group was on Write-Only Memory, which would appear to be the ideal archival medium for *Facts of Life*. That was before a variety of storage media seemed to *become* write-only memory.

Open Access: Market Size, Share, Forecast, and Trends

This one surely is not *intended* as humor—it's an [announcement](#) from Outsell of a new report to "help stakeholders in the STM segment understand OA's implications, where it has support and the speed at which it's transitioning into the market."

The report is 36 pages long.

It sells for $895, which gets you a PDF.

Just to clarify: *There is nothing wrong with charging for good commentary* about *OA*, whether it's ALA doing the charging (*Open Access: What You Need to Know Now*), MIT (*Open Access*) or anybody Else. And there is nothing actually *wrong* with a company that "help[s] the world's publishers, information providers, and enterprise marketers grow revenue, deliver superior solutions, optimize their clients' performance, and thrive in a fast-changing global digital market" charging $895 for a 36-page report. Even if the company does verb grow and emphasize it—the boldface is in the original. I just find it amusing.

Recent Developments and Updates

This is the first of three sections devoted to stuff that's mostly happened in the last few months—the most general (or miscellaneous) of the three.

DOAJ hits the 1 MILLION mark!

A press release from the Directory of Open Access Journals [issued March 12, 2013](#). It notes a new environment for the directory—and two milestones:

1. For the first time since launch in 2003, more than 50% of the journals are providing metadata at article level. We will continue to work with the 2000+ publishers to increase this figure.

2. [More than 1 million articles](#) are now searchable in DOAJ which means more than 1 million article-

level metadata entries are available for harvesting! We expect this figure to increase significantly in the months to come.

No comment required other than congratulations.

The Real Digital Change Agent

This one's by Jason Mittell, [posted March 4, 2013](#) at *The Chronicle Review*—and it's about a group you may or may not have heard of: [Coapi](#), the Coalition of Open Access Policy Institutions.

If you haven't heard of it, the Coalition of Open Access Policy Institutions, which now comprises more than 40, began in 2011 as a way for colleges to coordinate and advocate for open-access policies, which typically require that all faculty journal publications be made available freely online, whether on a personal Web site, institutional repository, or discipline-specific public archive. Such reforms tend to be driven by a few faculty and staff members (usually librarians and technologists), with a ground-level commitment to open access, who manage to persuade their administrations and colleagues—and by the federal government, which just required that publications from federally supported research be made available freely online.

Mittell draws contrasts between the very high profile of MOOCs and the relatively low profile of open-access policies. He's wary of the MOOC boosterism and views them with "measured skepticism."

But I am fascinated by the contrasting rhetoric between the rapid-boil fervor over MOOCs and the barely simmering apathy for open-access policies, especially at the institutional level. MOOCs are often touted in university news releases as being motivated by the desire to increase access to work of faculty freely across the globe. The MOOC leader Coursera's own mission is to "empower people with education that will improve their lives, the lives of their families, and the communities they live in."

But fewer than 20 percent of the American institutions that have formed partnerships with Coursera are also members of Coapi. That seems downright hypocritical to me, as opening access to faculty research would help level hierarchies and tear down boundaries between academics and the public, between major research universities and less-wealthy institutions, and between the developed and developing worlds. Access to the average journal article might do little to change the world. But making the bulk of scholarly research freely available could transform the possibilities of educational uplift, scientific discovery, and public engagement with academic work.

Why the disconnect? Mittell offers the usual answer: *money*—specifically, commercializing higher education. That discussion and much of the essay is specif-

ically about MOOCs—and I'm not covering MOOCs at all (intentionally). Still, an interesting comparison.

The comments are an interesting blend of attacks on OA, attacks on the author and, once in a while, some useful commentary (including some from Barbara Fister).

Nature Publishing Group and Frontiers form alliance to further open science

This press release appeared on the *frontiers* site on February 27, 2013. The "alliance" is that NPG has purchased ("a majority investment in") Frontiers, a "Swiss-based open access publisher." Frontiers is (or was) a "grassroots initiative" begun in 2007. It claims more than 25,000 "high-impact researchers" on its editorial boards for its "rapidly growing number of community-driven journals" and published more than 5,000 articles in 2012.

Frontiers' journals are all titled "Frontiers in…" followed by the name of the field; as of this writing, there are 15 such journals, all in science and medicine. The journals are all Gold OA—and use the CC BY license. The journals do charge APCs, claimed to be among the lowest in their fields, running somewhere between €575 and €2,000 (with additional page charges in some cases.

No additional comment.

Journal Archive Opens Up (Some)

That's one version of the title of this January 9, 2013 article by Alexandra Tilsley at *Inside Higher Education;* the other is "JSTOR to offer limited free access to content from 1,200 journals." In either case, while it's good news for those of us without institutional affiliations, I'm not sure it belongs in an OA roundup—especially since access requires registration.

The program allows us unaffiliated scum to read (but not download or copy) up to three articles every two weeks—after we've registered and provided personal information "including institutional affiliation and field of study." That's why publishers sign up: They get information on potential subscribers.

Here's an interesting segment:

> 150,000 users signed up for Register & Read during the pilot, though McGregor notes that number is only one out of every 75 people who landed on a JSTOR article since the program launched. Of those 150,000, 30 percent used the program more than once.

> But more interestingly, perhaps, only 16 percent of those registered users are independent researchers, the primary intended audience for the project. Instead, most users have been students.

Barbara Fister's quoted in the article and offers speculation as to why that high level of student use might happen. It's a good article—Tilsley also quotes Timothy Vollmer of Creative Commons, who shies away from calling this open access, since it's not.

The Journal of Creative Library Practice

There's a new no-fee Gold OA CC BY librarianship journal in town—*The Journal of Creative Library Practice*. It's probably the most formal outgrowth to date of the Library Society of the World and is credited as such. I'm going to quote the whole "About" page:

> Do you or your team have a creative technical solution to a problem, creative social solution, or creative policy solutions to a problem? Do you have any creative fundraising ideas? Can you make amazing creative signage for your library? Have you creatively designed a website? Did you employ out of the box thinking? What worked, and what didn't work? *The Journal of Creative Library Practice* will provide an outlet for librarians and information professionals to describe and encourage greater creativity in library and information center communications, policies, collections, instruction, and other areas of librarianship.

> This journal intends to reach librarians and information professionals of all types, including academic, public, school, special, medical, legal, and others. We would also like to reach out to readers interested in libraries as well as those interesting in critical information studies. Other readers may include teachers, parents, business people or college students. If a reader is interested in learning more about the creative use of technologies, policies or services to enhance the exchange of information from one person to another (or from one computer to another), then they may be interested in this journal.

> The journal is edited by the following people:

> - Amy Buckland (McGill University)
> - Barbara Fister (Gustavus Adolphus College)
> - Colleen Harris (University of Tennessee at Chattanooga)
> - Marie Kennedy (Loyola Marymount University)
> - Joseph R. Kraus (University of Denver) Editorial Facilitator

> If you would like to learn a little more about the history, the journal was hatched over several discussions in the Library Society of the World FriendFeed room.

jclp (as its logo styles it) is using an innovative and *very* low-cost publication method: Articles appear in HTML format as blog posts on the journal website. (Submissions are in Word .doc or .docx format or an RTF format.) So there won't be issues as such—

just articles when they're ready and refereed. Yes, articles are already appearing—not a huge flood (nor is one expected), but an initial stream.

Full disclosure: I was involved in the initial discussion but failed to provide actual assistance to the group, so you should probably ignore my comments if you read the discussions. My bad. But hey, with an editorial group like that, how can you go wrong?

You may also want to read "Six Questions for Joseph Kraus and a Board of Creative Librarians" by Meredith Schwartz on February 14, 2013 at *Library Journal*. It provides some interesting additional background and perspective.

How PeerJ's architecture keeps costs down for academics

Several items in the January 2013 *Cites & Insights* discussed *PeerJ*, a new model in open access journals, with a $99-per-author-for-life (for one article a year) approach to APCs that's far lower than most fee-charging science and technology journals. This February 18, 2013 post at *PeerJ—the blog* discusses the backend architecture of *PeerJ*—and how the site was "effortlessly able to support a 2000% increase in traffic on launch day with zero down time or any slowing of the site."

It's an interesting discussion, a little heavy on tech but worth reading.

Academic publishing is evolving—PeerJ publishes its first articles

This comes from Graham Steel on February 12, 2013 at *figshare*. *PeerJ* published its first 30 peer-reviewed articles that day; the post has some comments on it. Again, worth reading (and following some of the links). As of this writing (March 26, 2013), the total is up to 58.

Librarians and Lawyers

Also titled "Another publisher accuses a librarian of libel," this February 15, 2013 article by Colleen Flaherty at *Inside Higher Ed* is about a threatened libel suit against Jeffrey Beall (the "predatory publishers" person) by the Canadian Center for Science and Education.

> Via its lawyer earlier this month, the Canadian Center for Science and Education, publisher of numerous open-access journals charging several-hundred dollar author fees, sent a letter to Beall informing him that his inclusion of the company and several of its products on a list of a possible-to-probable "predatory" journals on his blog amounted to defamation and libel.

> The letter requests that Beall remove the publisher's name and those of its journals – Sciedu Press, Macrothink Institute and RedFame Publishing – from the blog immediately, due to their inclusion's "natural tendency to injure our client's reputation." If Beall doesn't comply in writing with such demands (including payment of $10,000 in lawyer fees and damages) by Monday, the publisher will subject him to "civil action" in a California court.

The letter regards Beall's "predatory publishers" list as libelous. In discussion, Barbara Fister couples the threat with the libel suit against Dale Askey, saying both cases attempt to "chill speech at a time when universities need librarians to help them navigate the rapidly changing publication landscape."

Except for two oddly-worded comments accusing Beall of being a tool of big publishers, most commenters agree with most of those quoted in the article that lawsuits against librarians are a *truly* stupid way for publishers to defend their reputations—especially if those publishers have any shortcomings.

Tectonic movements toward OA in the UK and Europe

That's the major article in the September 2, 2012 *SPARC Open Access Newsletter*, and while it's quite long, I think it's worth reading especially if you're interested in the Finch/RCUK situation, which I'm not directly covering.

About COAR

Not so much a recent development as an update and reminder about the Confederation of Open Access Repositories, "a young, fast growing association of repository initiatives launched in October 2009." COAR currently represents 90 institutions in Europe, North America and Latin America. The site will tell you a lot more—including the oddly restrictive license at the bottom: CC BY-NC-SA.

Knowledge Unlatched

This one *is* newer:

> A global library consortium enabling open access books. Knowledge Unlatched is helping libraries to work together for a sustainable open future for specialist academic books. Our vision is a healthy market that includes free access for end users.

Open acess *books*. A library consortium. Distinctly different from mainstream OA. It's also an odd one—offering funding *to publishers* through a fee paid by the consortium's member libraries:

> Because the fixed costs associated with getting to first digital copy will be covered by the Knowledge Unlatched Title Fee, it will be possible for publishers

to sell physical copies of books, or e-book versions, to consortium member libraries at an agreed discount. Publishers will also have the flexibility to experiment with different approaches to maximising their profits across a wider market. For example, they might choose to publish books in paper-back rather than hard-back, or develop premium value-added content that libraries may be willing to pay extra for. They may also be able to take on authors or manuscripts that would previously have been considered too risky to publish in a shrinking book market because the risks associated with publishing specialist scholarly monographs will be mitigated by the consortium through the Title Fee.

It appears that the model works by publishers offering (not yet published) titles to libraries; if enough libraries sign up, the publisher gets the upfront money, the title becomes OA *as an ebook* (actually in PDF and HTML forms), the libraries get discounts on print versions and—well, it's an interesting approach. The pilot will take place in the second half of 2013, including "publishers from all around the world and several hundred libraries." The pilot will run for three years.

I'm not sure what to say or think about this idea, so for now I'll just point you to the link.

Why I've also joined the good guys

You may remember a Tim Gowers item with a similar title earlier in this essay. This was Gowers' next post at *Gowers's Weblog* on January 16, 2013. In it, he discusses the creation of a platform that "will make it very easy to set up arXiv overlay journals."

> What is an arXiv overlay journal? It is just like an electronic journal, except that instead of a website with lots of carefully formatted articles, all you get is a list of links to preprints on the arXiv. The idea is that the parts of the publication process that academics do voluntarily—editing and refereeing—are just as they are for traditional journals, and we do without the parts that cost money, such as copy-editing and typesetting.

The overlay model could work for any OA journal with a suitable repository—and can also work for OA journals that release "typeset" and copy-edited articles as soon as they're ready, then prepare "issue" tables of contents as overlays. This one's different because the overlay is to "preprints." (Although the term "preprints" seems inappropriate in this context, since there's no "pre" involved. How about "un-laid-out"?) The effort is headed by the Episciences Project which uses the unlovely "epijournals" to refer to these overlay journals.

It's an interesting if slightly vague introduction to an interesting (if slightly vague) project, accompanied by a *long* set of comments (I gave up less than 1/3 of the way through), many of which appear to be about the possibility of open comment pages attached to each article.

Mathematicians aim to take publishers out of publishing

That's the title for this January 17, 2013 piece by Richard Van Noorden at *Nature*—and it begs the question of whether any community that does a journal, overlay or otherwise, isn't *automatically* a publisher.

But, of course, there's a qualifying word that doesn't appear in the title—but does in the second paragraph:

> The initiative, called the Episciences Project, hopes to show that researchers can organize the peer review and publication of their work at minimal cost, without involving commercial publishers. [Emphasis added.]

I think the penultimate word in that one-sentence paragraph is key here. It's an interesting brief story. Van Noorden cites one existing "free, community-organized mathematics journal"—actually a society journal—with the dismissive comment from an Episciences founder that such journals aren't global-scale. *DOAJ* lists dozens of other no-fee Gold OA journals in mathematics.

Announcing a New (and Free) Database of Open Access Scholarship

This announcement appears on an ALA site that's mostly designed to support press releases related to ALA conferences—in this case, Midwinter 2013. Here's the gist:

> Bepress Digital Commons invites you to explore a new database of open access scholarship (600,000+ articles) that is curated by university librarians and their supporting institutions, and represents thousands of disciplines and subject areas — from Architecture to Zoology. Your patrons will never run into paywalls or empty records, because only full-text, open access research and scholarship are included. This new resource for researchers includes scholarship from hundreds of universities and colleges, including peer-reviewed journal articles, book chapters, dissertations, working papers, conference proceedings, and other original scholarly work. It continues to grow rapidly thanks to the contributions of researchers, librarians, faculty, and students who believe that scholarship is a community enterprise.

The home page is a fancy interactive graphic—put your cursor over any segment of the big color wheel and a sidebar shows the field, works, disciplines, institutions and downloads. (It really is a fancy wheel: The inner ring has the major segments, an

outer ring has subdivisions and, in some cases, a third ring has sub-subdivisions. So, for example, you can go from Arts & Humanities with some 52,000 works, to Music with some 3,800, and all the way to Ethnomusicology with some 900. Clicking on any area creates a new graphic for that area.)

I find the color wheel more amusing than helpful, but text-oriented idiots like me can also do a direct search or click on one of the major areas in a set of links, which then opens up a set of recent articles and list of sub-disciplines. That's how I finally found Library and Information Science (11,316 works at this writing), a subdivision of Social and Behavorial Sciences.

It's an interesting approach because it's at least partly *collection*-oriented, albeit with direct searching. So, for example, when I looked at it in late March 2013, one "featured publication" for LIS was "Charleston Library Conference"—but from Purdue University, not where I'd expect it. Following that link yields a Charleston Conference page with links to browse the proceedings for each of three recent Charleston Conferences.

IEEE Access

IEEE announced another new Gold OA megajournal, *IEEE Access*. As described here, "the scope of this all-electronic, archival publication comprises all IEEE fields of interest, emphasizing applications-oriented and interdisciplinary articles." The journal will follow the megajournal rules (that is, the *PLoS ONE* model): "binary" peer-review process that doesn't look for level of importance, fast peer review—and a "convenient author-pays publishing model, with an article processing charge of US$1,750 per article." Is that a reasonable charge? Well, it's just a little over the *PLoS ONE* price…

The Journal of Library Administration

This whole foofaraw erupted after I'd "closed" the set of tagged items for this roundup, but it's interesting enough to include—although I don't think it's over yet. (I thought about giving it a section heading, but I'm not sure it deserves that much, even though I'll be linking to several posts.)

I believe Brian Mathews wrote about it first, in "So I'm editing this journal issue and…" on March 23, 2013 at *The Ubiquitous Librarian*. The backstory is that Mathews agreed to guest-edit a special issue of *The Journal of Library Administration* (henceforth *JLA*) on what academic libraries might "become or cease to be" fifteen years from now. This wasn't a set of peer-reviewed research papers; it was a set of in-

vited papers—due in May 2013 for an August 2013 publication date. Then comes this:

> The sad truth is that we'll never see this particular issue of the *Journal of Library Administration*. I received an email this morning from Damon announcing that he and the entire Editorial Board of *JLA* resigned their positions. Here is the gist:
>
> "The Board believes that the licensing terms in the Taylor & Francis author agreement are too restrictive and out-of-step with the expectations of authors in the LIS community."
>
> "A large and growing number of current and potential authors to JLA have pushed back on the licensing terms included in the Taylor & Francis author agreement. Several authors have refused to publish with the journal under the current licensing terms."
>
> "Authors find the author agreement unclear and too restrictive and have repeatedly requested some form of Creative Commons license in its place."
>
> "After much discussion, the only alternative presented by Taylor & Francis tied a less restrictive license to a $2995 per article fee to be paid by the author. As you know, this is not a viable licensing option for authors from the LIS community who are generally not conducting research under large grants."
>
> "Thus, the Board came to the conclusion that it is not possible to produce a quality journal under the current licensing terms offered by Taylor & Francis and chose to collectively resign."

I find myself sighing a little over what comes next:

> So that's my Saturday. I know that these political statements happen occasionally where boards step down to make a point. I just wish they would have waited until September. While I'm sure that these authors could easily publish elsewhere, the most exciting part for me was the cohesive package—that these individual papers (these aspirational ideas) would be bound together.
>
> While I can understand and appreciate the stance of the Board, I personally try to stay clear these politics. I am a practitioner of open access but I would not call myself an advocate. Author rights and related matters are critical and I'm glad that our profession is taking a stand. But me, my strengths are ideation and so it's on to new projects.

"A practitioner of open access" might not be putting together a special issue for a toll-access journal in the first place; to not only call a principled statement "political" but to wish it hadn't happened until the issue came out…well, maybe you'll find that last sentence satisfactory.

He updated the post after several people suggested publishing the special issue in an OA journal "or even starting a new journal":

The reason I agreed to take on the guest editorship of this issue was specifically because it was in a traditional journal and distributed by a traditional publisher. I like the idea of taking *disruptive* content and baking it into a conventional platform. I'm a fan of OA but this was one instance where I was intentionally aiming for something with more *confinement*. You know, change from within, and all that.

Also—while I received a lot of positive feedback from the STARTUP paper, a few readers gave me a hard time by saying that it was "interesting but not scholarly enough." I would agree with that assessment but they meant it as criticism whereas I saw that as a positive attribute. So this was my attempt to infiltrate the scholarly domain and bring along my style of expression.

I'm half tempted to add a few more authors and pitch this on kick starter as both an open web package AND a glossy collectable print booklet too. We'll see where it all goes. Time to prep for ACRL.

Since Mathews' own stances aren't the real topic here, maybe I should just quote that and pass on by. I didn't find the outline of papers all that "disruptive" in any real-world sense; I'll be hornswoggled if I can figure out how *limiting its readership* is effective "change from within."

   Never mind. The key here is that the *JLA* editorial board had enough and all resigned. And *lots* of people covered that event and its implications. A few of them:

➢ Peter Suber posted "Editorial board resigns from T&F journal to protest restrictive licensing" on March 24, 2013 on Google+. It's a straightforward discussion with this key paragraph:

It looks like the editorial board has not yet taken a further step, such as building on its experience and credibility to launch a new, OA or less-restrictive journal to cover the same research niche. I realize that would be a big step. But the board should know that 20 previous boards at other journals resigned en masse to protest restrictive publisher policies, and then took the next step of launching new journals with less restrictive policies. Here's the inspiring list of those 20 cases from the Open Access Directory.

One of the earliest of those was in 1998, when the editorial board of *JAL*, the *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, resigned to protest the hike in subscription prices when Elsevier purchased the journal. Some of the editors then created *portal: Libraries and the Academy*—which is also a subscription journal, but cheaper and university-published. Not *hugely* cheaper, but still cheaper.

➢ Jason Griffey was one of the possible authors, and wrote about it in "The Journal of Library Administration" on March 23, 2013 at *Pattern Recognition*. Griffey doesn't sign over copyright—and wouldn't sign T&F's license. I like his comment enough to quote it here:

I'll be blunt: there is no situation in which I'd sign copyright over the T&F…or, frankly, anyone. I'm very happy to sign a license of limited exclusivity (say, 30-90 days) for publication, or license the work generally under a CC license and give T&F a specific exemption on NC so they can publish it. But their language about "Our belief is that the assignment of copyright in an article by the author to us or to the proprietor of a journal on whose behalf we publish remains the best course of action for proprietor and author alike, as assignment allows Taylor & Francis, without ambiguity, to assure the integrity of the Version of Scholarly Record, founded on rigorous and independent peer review. " is just…well, bollocks.

I am very interested in the topic, and I've got a ton to say about it…would love to write it. But we'd have to work out the copyright issue.

I'm *really trying* not to make this about Brian Mathews, but…

Brian's response from a week or so later indicated that the combination of speed of production (the deadline for the chapters was May 1) and the lack of communication from Taylor and Francis meant this wasn't going to work out for me to be involved. I was bummed, but totally understood and let him know that I'd love to work on something else with him when the stakes were different.

There's more to Griffey's post and it's worth reading.

➢ Chris Bourg was—briefly—on the journal's editorial board and writes about the situation in "My short stint on the JLA Editorial Board," posted March 23, 2013 at *Feral Librarian*. Bourg also agreed to write an article for the journal—with some misgivings regarding licensing. Then came the breakdown; she was part of the resignation, which Bourg terms "as much a practical one as a political one."

➢ Without detailed quotes, other worthwhile posts include John Dupuis' "Journal of Library Administration editorial board resigns over author rights" on March 24, 2013 at *Confessions of a Science Librarian*; "Job well done" on March 23, 2013 by Library Loon at *Gavia Libraria*; "Open Access Tenure: The Journal of Library Administration" by Abigail Goben on March 25, 2013 at *Hedgehog Librarian*; "JLA

Board Resigns Over Licensing Terms" by Meredith Schwartz on March 27, 2013 at *Library Journal* (including comments from T&F's editorial director); and "JLA Lights the Way" by Scott Walter on March 25, 2013 at *ACRLog*. That last one—Walter is the current editor of *College & Research Libraries*, ACRL's scholarly journal, which has become a no-fee Gold OA journal—includes a final paragraph worth quoting (and relating to a call to action by Barbara Fister cited early in the post):

The former editorial board of the *Journal of Library Administration* is being justly recognized for taking a stand on behalf of their authors and on behalf of a field that has made a commitment to promoting author rights, but Fister's original question still pertains: given our commitment as a field to open access and author rights, and given what we know about the limitations of the still-predominant model of scholarly communications in our field, and given the easy access that many of us possess to the tools that allow for the launch of high-quality, open access titles that may fill the niche currently held by commercial journals, why are the actions of the former JLA board still so unusual? Why do so many of us still serve as the editorial leadership for journals whose policies do not reflect our ideals? Why do I? In the interest of full disclosure, I will note that, while editor of *College & Research Libraries*, I continue to serve on a number of other editorial boards, including those of journals published by commercial publishers whose policies regarding open access and author rights may not be precisely what I wish them to be. Fister suggested that I re-think that service a year ago, but I'm slow. Now Jaggars and company have suggested it again. It's time for me to look at this seriously, if only because it will give me more time to promote the development of C&RL as an open access journal and to collaborate more effectively with other OA journals in library and information science.

What comes next? Well, that editorial board *could* start a new administration-oriented OA journal; there's at least one solid Gold OA journal in that general area—LLAMA's *Library Leadership & Management*—but there may be room for more. *JLA* is widely held—801 libraries according to World-cat.org—but so is LL&M (1,034).

The White House and FASTR

What happens if you mount a petition…and it gets answered? It's not clear just how direct the connection was, but that's part of the story here, one of two

fairly major new initiatives, one by executive order and another legislative initiative.

But first there's FRPAA, the Federal Research Public Access Act. It built on the NIH mandate by reducing the maximum embargo and broadening it to other Federal agencies. Introduced three times, it never went very far. This page will fill you in on the situation with FRPAA. Note this paragraph under "Versions of the bill":

Note that FRPAA was not re-introduced in the 113th Congress. Instead, the Congressional supporters of OA revised the language and submitted a stronger new bill called the Fair Access to Science and Technology Research Act (FASTR). For more details, see our notes on FASTR.

That link should serve as a good ongoing source of information on the Fair Access to Science and Technology Research Act, FASTR. As you'd expect, library and OA groups—and *some* publishing groups—favor FASTR. Who's opposed? The AAP: No surprise there.

Major new bill mandating open access introduced in Congress

That's Peter Suber's February 14, 2013 writeup at Google+; it's a good place to start (as is the link above). "The quickest introduction is to say that FASTR is a strengthened version of FRPAA."

Here's how FASTR differs from FRPAA:

- FASTR contains a provision on coordinating agency policies (4.a 2): "To the extent practicable, Federal agencies required to develop a policy...shall follow common procedures for the collection and depositing of research papers." This will reduce the burden on universities that need to comply with procedures at all the covered agencies, and should have no detrimental effect on OA. Indeed, it should improve compliance with agency OA policies.

- FASTR contains three provisions calling for libre OA or open licensing:
  - FASTR includes a new "finding" in its preamble (2.3): "the United States has a substantial interest in maximizing the impact and utility of the research funds by enabling a wide range of reuses of the peer-reviewed literature that reports the results of such research, including by enabling computational analysis by state-of-the-art technologies."
  - FASTR includes a formatting and licensing provision (4.b.5): the versions deposited in repositories and made OA shall be distributed "in formats and under terms that enable

productive reuse, including computational analysis by state-of-the-art technologies."

o FASTR requires that the annual report from each covered agency include a statement from the agency on "whether the terms of use applicable to such research papers are effective in enabling productive reuse and computational analysis by state-of-the-art technologies" (4.f.2.B.i) and the results of the agency's "examination of whether such research papers should include a royalty-free copyright license that is available to the public and that permits the reuse of those research papers, on the condition that attribution is given to the author or authors of the research and any others designated by the copyright owner" (4.f.2.B.ii).

Suber discusses FASTR further in the March 2, 2013 *SPARC Open Access Newsletter*, discussed a little later in this section.

Publishers Blast New Open Access Bill, FASTR

That's the headline for Andrew Albanese's February 15, 2013 story at *Publishers' Weekly*—and Albanese quotes SPARC's Heather Joseph on the need for FASTR before dealing with the Association of American Publishers and Allan Adler's typical (and predictable) fulminations.

> As expected, AAP swiftly issued a statement condemning FASTR. "Different name, same boondoggle," concluded AAP officials. In opposing FASTR, AAP officials channeled their inner Mitt Romney—labeling the law a wasteful big government program that would impose a nightmare of regulatory burden on researchers and duplicate activity from publishers.
>
> "This bill would waste so much taxpayers' money at a time of budgetary crisis, squander federal employees' time with busywork and require the creation and maintenance of otherwise-unneeded technology," said Allan Adler, general counsel and v-p, government affairs, AAP, "all the while ignoring the fact that its demands are already being performed successfully by the private sector."
>
> AAP deeply opposes public access mandates, which they see as undermining their role in scholarly publishing, and the introduction of FASTR once again ramps up the tension between public access advocates—who have gained significant momentum in recent years—and publishers.

This "waste of taxpayers' money" argument has been used against the NIH mandate and continues to be nonsense, unless you actually believe that "the private sector" is providing open access in any useful manner. For NIH and Pubmed, the amount of

"wasted" money is demonstrably trivial; there's no reason to believe it would be otherwise for FASTR, while the reduced embargo would *assuredly* improve access to research.

The only comment on the item is bemusing: Even though there's *nothing* in it about Gold OA (FASTR mandates Green OA), Stevan Harnad feels obliged to toss in another screed, albeit a relatively short one. Oh, and he's now saying that "virtually all the top journals" are subscription-based—further doing his remarkable part to undermine Gold OA by denying that it works.

AAP STATEMENT ON FASTR ACT

Here's a link to the actual February 14, 2013 statement from AAP—and, indeed, the actual headline, centered above the release, is "Different Name, Same Boondoggle" in quotes.

I don't believe there's anything useful in the press release that Albanese didn't cover, but you can read it for yourself.

Publishers versus libraries

And here's Mike Taylor, on February 16 at *SV-POW* (I've spelled it out often enough…), and Taylor pulls no punches:

> A couple of years ago, Matt wrote about the conflict between authors and publishers. Yesterday, two official statements about the FASTR bill showed us with devastating clarity that publishers are opposed to libraries, too.

He doesn't spend a lot of time on the details of FASTR and why it's a good idea; for the purposes of his discussion "it doesn't matter what's actually in the act."

> All you need to know is in the two statements: one issued by the Association of American Publishers (AAP), and one from the Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL). AAP is against the FASTR bill, and ACRL is for it. For our present purposes, it doesn't matter what their various reasons are. All we need to know is that publishers want the opposite of what libraries want.
>
> t's time to abandon the comforting but laughable fiction that barrier-based publishers are our friends, our colleagues or our partners. They're not. They're our enemies. Hard words, but true ones. In the immortal words of Tom Holtz, "Sorry if that makes some people feel bad, but I'm not in the 'make people feel good business'; I'm a scientist."
>
> –
>
> "But Mike", you say. "Not all the publishers that are members of the AAP agree with its stance." That is good news, Fictional Interlocutor. I greatly look

forward to seeing them break ranks, one by one, to repudiate the AAP's antediluvian and anti-science stance. Bring it on, Good Guy Publishers. I will be delighted to give credit just as soon as some is due.

In an update he notes a letter in support of FASTR signed by ten organizations—library and otherwise. Since he links to the ACRL letter and the group letter (you've already had a link to the AAP press release), I won't bother to do it separately.

I could discuss more early statements regarding FASTR, but it's legislation—if anything happens, it will take a while. And a few days later, something bigger happened…

Expanding Public Access to the Results of Federally Funded Research

That's the heading on a statement posted by Michael Stebbins on February 22, 2013 at the blog of the Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP). Here's the whole thing:

> The Obama Administration is committed to the proposition that citizens deserve easy access to the results of scientific research their tax dollars have paid for. That's why, in a policy memorandum released today, OSTP Director John Holdren has directed Federal agencies with more than $100M in R&D expenditures to develop plans to make the published results of federally funded research freely available to the public within one year of publication and requiring researchers to better account for and manage the digital data resulting from federally funded scientific research. OSTP has been looking into this issue for some time, soliciting broad public input on multiple occasions and convening an interagency working group to develop a policy. The final policy reflects substantial inputs from scientists and scientific organizations, publishers, members of Congress, and other members of the public—over 65 thousand of whom recently signed a *We the People* petition asking for expanded public access to the results of taxpayer-funded research.
>
> To see the new policy memorandum, please visit: http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/__micro-sites/ostp/ostp_public_access_memo_2013.pdf
>
> To see Dr. Holdren's response to the We the People petition, please visit: https://petitions.whitehouse.gov/response/increasing-public-access-results-scientific-research

That's it. Short and sweet, with direct reference to the petition on open access.

The memorandum itself is a six-page PDF; I'd suggest that you go read it yourself. The response to the petition, by Dr. John Holdren, director of OSTP, is also worth quoting in full:

Increasing Public Access to the Results of Scientific Research

By Dr. John Holdren

Thank you for your participation in the We the People platform. The Obama Administration agrees that citizens deserve easy access to the results of research their tax dollars have paid for. As you may know, the Office of Science and Technology Policy has been looking into this issue for some time and has reached out to the public on two occasions for input on the question of how best to achieve this goal of democratizing the results of federally-funded research. Your petition has been important to our discussions of this issue.

The logic behind enhanced public access is plain. We know that scientific research supported by the Federal Government spurs scientific breakthroughs and economic advances when research results are made available to innovators. Policies that mobilize these intellectual assets for re-use through broader access can accelerate scientific breakthroughs, increase innovation, and promote economic growth. That's why the Obama Administration is committed to ensuring that the results of federally-funded scientific research are made available to and useful for the public, industry, and the scientific community.

Moreover, this research was funded by taxpayer dollars. Americans should have easy access to the results of research they help support.

To that end, I have issued a memorandum today (.pdf) to Federal agencies that directs those with more than $100 million in research and development expenditures to develop plans to make the results of federally-funded research publically available free of charge within 12 months after original publication. As you pointed out, the public access policy adopted by the National Institutes of Health has been a great success. And while this new policy call does not insist that every agency copy the NIH approach exactly, it does ensure that similar policies will appear across government.

As I mentioned, these policies were developed carefully through extensive public consultation. We wanted to strike the balance between the extraordinary public benefit of increasing public access to the results of federally-funded scientific research and the need to ensure that the valuable contributions that the scientific publishing industry provides are not lost. This policy reflects that balance, and it also provides the flexibility to make changes in the future based on experience and evidence. For example, agencies have been asked to use a 12-month embargo period as a guide for developing their policies, but also to provide a mechanism for stakeholders to petition the agency to change that period. As agencies move forward with

developing and implementing these polices, there will be ample opportunity for further public input to ensure they are doing the best possible job of reconciling all of the relevant interests.

In addition to addressing the issue of public access to scientific publications, the memorandum requires that agencies start to address the need to improve upon the management and sharing of scientific data produced with Federal funding. Strengthening these policies will promote entrepreneurship and jobs growth in addition to driving scientific progress. Access to pre-existing data sets can accelerate growth by allowing companies to focus resources and efforts on understanding and fully exploiting discoveries instead of repeating basic, pre-competitive work already documented elsewhere. For example, open weather data underpins the forecasting industry and provides great public benefits, and making human genome sequences publically available has spawned many biomedical innovations—not to mention many companies generating billions of dollars in revenues and the jobs that go with them. Going forward, wider availability of scientific data will create innovative economic markets for services related to data curation, preservation, analysis, and visualization, among others.

So thank you again for your petition. I hope you will agree that the Administration has done its homework and responded substantively to your request.

I think it's worth quoting in full because it's a big step forward—although it's not as good as FASTR and, as you'll see, not *nearly* good enough for some observers who seem to think that three-quarters of a loaf is much worse than none.

Second shoe drops: new White House Directive mandates OA

That's Peter Suber's February 22, 2013 comment at Google+.

This is big. It's big in its own right, and even bigger when put together with FASTR, the bipartisan OA bill introduced into both houses of Congress just eight days ago. We now have OA mandates coming from both the executive and legislative branches of government. [Emphasis added.]

The two approaches complement one another. FASTR does not make the White House directive unnecessary. FASTR may never be adopted. And if it is adopted, it will be after some time for study, education, lobbying, amendment, negotiation, and debate. By contrast, the White House directive takes effect today. The wheels are already turning. Compared to this executive action, FASTR is slower. (Thanks to Becky Cremona for this good line.)

Similarly, the White House directive does not make FASTR unnecessary. On the contrary, we need legislation to codify federal OA policies. The next president could rescind today's White House directive, but could not rescind legislation. (One lesson: Don't let up on efforts to persuade Congress to pass FASTR.)

There's more, including key differences between the White House mandate and FASTR's provision—one of which is the length of the embargo, with the White House allowing 12 months and *potentially* longer. I recommend reading the post and comments.

AAP Supports OSTP Policy Urging Collaboration in Public Access

And there, in another February 22, 2013 statement, is the big cloud accompanying this announcement: If AAP favors it, *something must be wrong*. I'll leave you to read the statement with its comment about "angry rhetoric and unreasonable legislation"; my most charitable interpretation is that AAP figured supporting the White House policy might help derail FASTR, which is a bigger step in many ways.

All you loons

The Library Loon expresses "awed recognition of what was accomplished today" in this February 22, 2013 post at *Gavia Libraria*. For some reason, I feel compelled to quote the whole (relatively short) thing:

The swans (perhaps even the Swans), they'll get their shiny awards and their keynotes and their recognition. The Loon doesn't grudge it; they deserve it. This post isn't for them, though. This post, in which the Loon dips her razor-beak in awed recognition of what was accomplished today, is for you. You know who you are, all you loons.

You who took hopeless Coordinator Syndrome institutional-repository and scholarly-communications jobs because you believed open access mattered.

You who tried to move unmovable committees, to convince intransigent scoffers.

You who ate dirt from skeptical colleagues, dismissive bosses, clueless faculty, publisher quislings, and hypocrites of every stripe. You who were brought to your knees by friendly fire.

You who did all you could with the nothing you had to work with.

You who walked the scary dark paths of setting-an-example, rather than the easy well-lit boulevards of lip-service-at-most.

You who built coalitions of the distinctly unwilling. You who seized on the least, most tenuous whisper of opportunity.

You who debunked the same idiotic myths and baldfaced lies the first time, the tenth time, the hundredth, the thousandth.

You who blogged. You who spoke. You who wrote. You who coded.

You who risked respect, publications, opportunities, jobs, careers, tenure. You who risked and lost.

You who were infallibly polite. You who weren't, so that others could be.

All you loons. The swans may swan about, but this is yours too, and no swan can take it from you. The Loon recognizes and applauds your fidelity, your toil, and your sacrifice.

There's not a lot I can add to that eloquence.

What an amazing day for open access

Mike Taylor at *SV-POW* seemed to think it was a good thing in this February 23, 2013 post—especially from his position as a UK scientist seeing retrograde actions on the RCUK front.

So it's one step back in the UK, two steps forward in America. With my nationalist hat on, it's a shame to see Britain so cravenly abandon its position of leadership in the worldwide move to open access. But I can't really care too much about that. Progress towards open access is not a zero-sum game: when America wins, we all win. And when we in the UK win — as we surely win — everyone will benefit from that, too.

Taylor recognizes that it's not perfect. He recognizes that there's still a lot of work to do. "But it represents significant progress." [Emphasis in the original.]

No celebrations here: why the White House public access policy is bad for open access

It took just two days (February 24, 2013) for Michael Eisen to declare—well, you can see the heading.

While virtually everyone in the open access movement is calling for "celebration" of this "landmark" event, I see a huge missed opportunity that will ultimately be viewed as a major setback for open access. Since I seem to be the only person with this point of view, I feel I should explain why.

Which he does—and if you're in the "half a loaf is worse than none" camp, it's probably a convincing argument. I'm sure it will endear OA advocates to the White House in efforts to gain more. "Screw you: What you did was backward."

Read the argument. I'm not going to quote more of it. He says "our government let us down." I find the whole thing—that is, Eisen's stance—sad. I think he's made it more difficult for FASTR advocates and other OA advocates to move forward, by

making it an "all or nothing" situation where the result is likely to be, well, not "all."

Eisen certainly wins the Wet Blanket Award for February 2013. In my reckoning, he also joins the growing rank of MY WAY OR THE HIGHWAY absolutists whose OA advocacy may do more harm than good.

Good government in action, and inaction

Kevin Smith offered this commentary on February 25, 2013 at *Scholarly Communications @ Duke*. He notes that the scholarly communications community was able to admire both positive action by the Administration—and a positive decision in favor of inaction.

The inaction: The Department of Justice chose *not* to file a brief in the appeal of the GSU case; the sense was that if DoJ *did* file, it would be on behalf of the publishers.

Then there is the action that was announced on Friday, and it could hardly have been better. The White House, after a long delay, issued a directive that instructs all federal agencies that have large research and development budgets to develop plans to make the articles that arise from such research funding publicly available within 12 months of publication. In short, the White House has recognized the success of the NIH public access mandate and has committed to providing the same benefit to taxpayers for the other research efforts that they fund. Additionally, the new directive also instructs agencies to examine data access and sharing, so it genuinely is seeking to improve the overall environment for research, and to give taxpayers a greater return on their investments.

Well…it *could* have been better. The 12-month embargo is longer than it should be. But still, it was a good thing. Smith goes on to discuss the undecided issue—e.g., what repositories will be used for non-NIH research? He suggests IRs. He winds up by saying, *properly*, that we still need FASTR.

Gold on hold

This one's a February 26, 2013 editorial at *Nature*—and it suggests to me that NPG has decided it can do well by getting its hands on as much Gold OA money as possible. Thus the discouraging subhead: "The move towards providing full open access to research papers was undermined last week, but should prevail in the long term." The first paragraph leaves no doubt:

A US announcement on open access was eagerly awaited. But when it came last week, the new policy was a blow for anyone who wants fully paid-for, immediate access to the results of publicly funded research. [Emphasis added.]

"Fully paid-for"? That makes no sense unless you assume that all Gold OA, is, or should be, APC-based Gold OA. If Gold OA journals don't charge APCs, there's *nothing to pay for*. And, indeed, when the editorial touts gold OA as the solution, it describes it thusly: "in which the published article is immediately freely available, paid for by a processing charge rather than by readers' subscriptions." Apparently, non-fee Gold OA *does not exist*.

So, where Mike Taylor sees the US being more progressive than the UK (because the UK's steadily weakening the RCUK policy), *Nature* applauds the UK for "acknowledge[ing] that publishers add value to the published versions of research, and that this value should be paid for explicitly." The editorial is fairly riddled with the notion that it's not OA unless publishers can stay healthy.

United States doubles down on open access to federally-funded research

That's the title for Peter Suber's lead essay in the March 2, 2013 *SPARC Open Access Newsletter*, discussing both FASTR and the White House directive at considerable length and with Suber's usual thoroughness and fairness. The best I can do is guide you there to learn a *lot* more about both situations, with plenty of links to explore further.

Opening Moves

What better way to close a section than with a Barbara Fister column—this time the "Library Babel Fish" column on February 28, 2013 in *Inside Higher Ed.*

> I have a friend who is tough-minded, outspoken, and perennially skeptical. She's not a pushover, and she's not the least bit sentimental. But last week, with the stroke of a pen, the president reduced her to tears.

I believe I may have the same friend.

Fister discusses the petition, the directive, the continued need for FASTR—and the fact that there really has been a lot of progress.

> Just a couple of years ago, open access to scholarly research seemed a cause that, like universal access to health care, was both sensible and doomed to fail. Too few of the powerful cared because they had the access they needed and didn't give much thought to those who didn't. The system seemed entrenched and too complex to overhaul. The small steps being taken toward open access seemed just that—small.

Just a couple of years ago, I'd pretty much given up writing about OA because it did seem to be moving so slowly—and because my efforts seemed pointless. Neither seems true any longer. Fister lists several of the important steps over recent months—I

refer you to the column for those, several of which I've mentioned here or elsewhere.

> Pushing that boulder up the hill seems at last to be a little easier, the hill less steep, and we can begin to imagine a point when the boulder will begin to roll on its own, gaining momentum once we're over the hump. We librarians need to seriously consider how we can retool our systems and resources to support this transition to openness. Neglect and business-as-usual won't cut it anymore. But that's okay, because we have the skills and the resources to make this work, and it will be so much more in alignment with our values than our current walled-garden members-only libraries are.
>
> I wouldn't have been able to imagine this much progress so quickly. Now I am beginning to think we'll soon look back and wonder why it took us so long.

One can only hope—or, rather, one can hope and do what one can to educate, inform, advocate.

Humanities & Social Sciences

There's nothing even remotely new about OA in the humanities and social sciences. Several of the earliest Gold OA journals—years before the term "OA" was defined or widely used—were in these fields. But in recent years, STEM (science, technology, engineering and medicine) has been where most of the publicity and visible action exists. That's hardly surprising: STEM is where most of the money is, both grant money and outrageous subscription prices.

One *nice* thing about OA in the humanities and social sciences is that, while development has been diffuse, it has mostly not involved APCs. In one study of more than 1,800 Gold OA journals, less than 11% of those in the arts & humanities and less than 13% of those in the social sciences charged fees—compared to percentages between 39% and 49.9% for STEM areas. (Business and economics showed 20.5% fee-charging OA journals, higher than arts, humanities and social sciences but *much* lower than STEM.)

Now there's movement to expand OA in H&SS—but some of that movement assumes models such as PLoS, fees and all. I'm not convinced that the megajournal-with-fees model is either necessary or desirable in other fields, especially in fields as diverse as those under the H&SS umbrella, but I'm not quite ready to come out against such developments. (Not that my coming out against them would have much impact!) I am acutely aware that some of my colleagues, ones I have considerable respect for, are not only eager to see this model

happen but actively involved with it. Maybe I'm dead wrong: it wouldn't be the first time.

Included here are several articles on a proposed PLoS-style project and a few other items relating to OA in H&SS.

Public Library of Humanities: Envisioning a New Open Access Platform

Tim McCormick posted this on December 20, 2012 at his eponymous blog. He says "A current focal point in this fraught situation, is the question of *how Open Access (OA) might work in the humanities and social sciences ("HSS")*. That wording seems to suggest that there hasn't been any OA in HSS, which is glaringly ahistoric—but McCormick's looking for a "great leap forward," a Big Thing.

Most of the post is a Storify-style set of tweets that, among other things, reveals the ignorance of some STEM OA people that OA essentially *originated* in HSS and an eager desire by some to ~~rip off~~ redirect library budgets to pay for OA in HSS, with APCs. You may find it interesting reading.

Call For Participants to Build a PLOS-style Model for the Humanities and Social Sciences

This January 9, 2013 post by Dr. Martin Paul Eve on his eponymous blog is a good starting point.

> For quite some time, I have been interested in/incensed by the scholarly publication system; the exclusions, iniquities and absurdities of it can be clearly seen from only a brief survey of the economic field. I have watched with despair as the sciences have made projects work while the humanities and social sciences have almost sleepwalked into a disaster.

I would argue that economics is in no way representative of H&SS in general. I would also argue that H&SS has many functioning OA journals, including a fair number of important ones. Economics? Maybe not so much, although DOAJ does list more than 200 OA journals in economics.

The post is mostly just a call for such a project, a set of bullets itemizing the kind of people Eve wants to see involved, and a link to the Open Library of Humanities. Here's the core of that site's About page:

> Welcome to the initial ideas hub for the Open LIbrary of Humanities (OLH): a project exploring a PLOS-style model for the humanities and social sciences. This site aims to give the background to and rationale for such a project along with an initial call for participants so that we can put a team together in Spring 2013. As a preliminary statement: we are not affiliated in any way with PLOS. This website will be used for the preliminary stages of develop-

ing the organisational structure of OLH, as we launch as a not-for-profit company, and in the run-up to launching the actual journal and database.

There are some oddities elsewhere on the site—e.g., the "Background to the project" page manages to assume that the British pound is worth *less* than the U.S. dollar—but it's nearly a brand-new initiative, and I'm sure editorial work will continue.

I guess I'm suggesting that you might want to explore the OLH site and draw your own conclusions. It is at the very least an *interesting* development. The suggestion in one set of committee minutes that existing Gold OA journals—nearly all of them no-fee journals—might find themselves either swallowed up or overshadowed by this mega-journal bothers me a *lot*, but—again—that's just me.

Q&A: Martin Eve on Why We Need a Public Library of the Humanities and Social Sciences

That's Meredith Schwartz on January 15, 2013 in *Library Journal*, and it's well worth reading. Take, for example, this early paragraph:

> My previous thinking had led me to believe that institutionally managed Gold journals could be a viable solution. However, I'm now concluding, following a prompt from Tim McCormick, that institutions are too disparate and fractured to pull this off as a coherent opposition project. Therefore, what is really needed, in my view, is a scholar-designed OA mega-venue, run on a non-commercial basis, sanctioned by major figures, with the lowest (and waivable) APCs possible for the under-funded humanities and social sciences (or institutional backing such that APCs aren't needed).

"Coherent opposition project"? If that means that only a well-funded megajournal can succeed against the big publishers, I guess that needs exploring. Whether one sees "disparate and fractured" journals in disparate and fractured fields as good or bad…well, that probably also needs exploring. It's *very* clear that Eve is All About Scale:

> There are several other initiatives and we're involved in dialogue with many of them already to see where resources can be pooled; Jason Kelly's project at IUPUI is one example, Brian Hole's UbiquityPress another, Sage Open is also up there, alongside Dan Scott's Humanities and Social Science Directories. I'm also not averse to a separate PLOSS and PLOH if that was the general consensus. The only argument I can see for combining them is, again, scale. I'm a big believer in cross-subsidising—if a discipline isn't "viable" financially, but others are exceeding their targets for sustainability, we can provide a platform that publishes based on a worth that goes beyond the financial.

Project Aims to Bring PLoS-Style Openness to the Humanities

Jennifer Howard wrote this on January 29, 2013 at *The Chronicle of Higher Education*…and I'll try to get past the first paragraph, which also seems to ignore more than two decades of OA history:

> Open access isn't just for scientists. Opening up research is an idea that appeals to more and more humanists and social scientists. The trick has been how those fields can support the open sharing of research.

And maybe that's the issue: If it isn't BIG, it's invisible? That several hundred (or several thousand) OA journals have been created in HSS, most of them still publishing, does not make it absurd to have an opening sentence like "Open access isn't just for scientists"? If that's the truth, I find it sad, but it also means I should get out of the way: The Megajournal Train is rolling down the tracks, APCs and all. It's a million-dollar project (or plans to be)—for starters.

Further down in the article, there is the admission that "the humanities and social sciences have a sometimes underappreciated history with open access"—although that admission seems limited to noting that Peter Suber is a philosopher, not mentioning actual, you know, *journals*. The "accumulated wealth of open-access publishing precedent" mentioned seems to boil down to PLoS.

Politics, Economics, and Screwing the Humanities

This post—by Wayne Bivens-Tatum on January 18, 2013 at *Academic Librarian*—isn't about megajournals, but it's certainly a cogent and relevant item. B-T is concerned with the effects of Big Deals and escalating STEM journal prices on the humanities—and specifically on monographs, still important in many humanities fields. His note on the general effects of the Big Deals:

> [O]ver time these inflexible packages have taken up more and more of the library budgets until many libraries have had to "gut" their book budgets, some to an extent where they have almost no money to spend on monographic purchases at all. We need to remember that book budgets aren't just gutted. Librarians *choose* to reduce spending on monographs to purchase journal packages that increase in price and decrease the flexibility of library budgeting, and that choice has consequences for library patrons that librarians rarely want to tell those patrons.

As he notes, this arrangement "benefits" scientific researchers because the more expensive journals and packages are almost entirely STEM.

> So over time, we've seen library support for scholars shift from what was perhaps more or less even

or fair funding across the board to funding which struggles to cope with science journal costs and damns any programs that are monograph-heavy, which most humanities programs are. Some of these libraries try to support PhD programs in English, history, philosophy, or music with tiny monograph budgets while still entering into the Big Deals on science journals with the major vendors.

Spinning off an earlier discussion in which one librarian denigrated decisions to move away from Big Deals, B-T sees another angle:

> To what extent has it been appropriate to sacrifice the short and long term good of patrons in the humanities for the short term good of not having to resist price increases or rethink journal packages that slowly squeeze monograph budgets to death? Are historians or literary scholars or musicologists less deserving because they're not in the sciences? If so, why bother to offer PhDs in programs that aren't adequately, or even fairly, supported by the library? If anything, humanists need library support more than scientists. For scientists, libraries hold the report of work done in a laboratory, but for humanists the library is the laboratory.

Indeed. There's more to the post, definitely worth reading. How it relates to OA?

> Putting the economics of science publishing ahead of scholarly publishing as a whole has done a disservice to the humanities and any monograph-heavy field. So, as a humanities librarian, if I do what I can to resist that assault by encouraging open-access scholarly publishing whenever and wherever I can, I'm not just making a professional (not personal or political) decision based on how I think scholarly publishing should operate, I'm also making a professional decision to support the work of scholars in the humanities who have been shortchanged at so many libraries over the past 20 years. Those patrons have needs, too.

How bad has the screwing been? One other post from an entirely different institution says that that institution's book budget was cut by 90% recently to try to retain subscriptions. What's the overall picture? That may deserve further study—since, as with any library situation, it's a complex of segments and sizes, not just one picture. (I'm finishing up just such a study—*The Big Deal and the Damage Done*—but it ends with 2010, and I suspect 2012 data will be especially interesting.)

SAGE makes Open Access more accessible to social science and humanities scholars…

That's part of the title of a press release from SAGE on January 24, 2013—and it surely looks like an

attempt to fend off major development of nonprofit OA in HSS. SAGE Open is intended to be a megajournal; SAGE modestly describes it as "the world's first broad-based gold open access journal for the social sciences and humanities." Certainly not the first Gold OA journal in SSH, but the first *broad-based* one. The initial APC will be $99.

SAGE calls itself "the world's largest independent academic publisher" and offers "SAGE Choice" in many of its journals, with the low, low price of $1,500 for HSS journals. $99 is surely a better price—but it's a *discount*, presumably subject to change at any time. Maybe after SAGE convinces people that commercial publishers can handle all this new-fangled OA stuff just fine?

As megajournals go, *SAGE Open* is small-scale: So far, for January-March 2013, I see 29 articles total. Going to the subject browse for the more than two years of the megajournal's existence, there have been a total of 15 articles in the humanities, 27 in "communication," 59 in sociology, 62 in education—and, I think, about 300 total, assuming no article shows up in more than one "subject collection." There are no articles in library & information science or librarianship; neither is there a heading. And, as I look at articles, it seems pretty clear that articles *do* appear in multiple collections, so it's likely that there are far fewer articles.)

Is SAGE really "the natural home for authors, editors and societies"—as its motto proclaims? I'm not convinced.

The tale of the open access 'ugly duckling'

This appeared on February 6, 2013 at *Open Scholarship*—and I can't find the author's name anywhere on the post or the blog.

> It is often assumed that the Humanities and Social Sciences disciplines is the open access' ugly duckling' lagging far behind the Science, Technology and Medicine collective. Whilst this may be true in terms of the pure volume of open access articles and journals published (in part due to both support and pressure from research funders), this is certainly not true in innovation, for example the hugely successful Open Humanities Press which publishes well-regarded open access books, and grassroots interest from academic staff.

> A lot of recent attention and dialogue has focussed on some of the negative attitudes shown towards open access in the Humanities and Social Sciences, whilst a lot of the positives have been under reported and ignored. I would like to take the time to

dwell on some of these and show the potential HSS has to become a beautiful open access swan.

There follows discussion of library-owned OA journal initiatives and megajournal approaches. Here's the concluding paragraph:

> I think that the social sciences and humanities is far from being the open access 'ugly duckling' that many people unfairly consider it to be. It is clear that there is an appetite from publishers, academics and libraries to change the way scholarly publishing works in the Humanities and Social Sciences by embracing the open ethos. Most people recognise that the current status quo is unsustainable; however, for meaningful change to happen a critical mass of authors, editors and reviewers need to be ready to participate. Similarly the financial figures need to add up and be sustainable in the longer term for all involved, including scholarly societies, libraries and publishers. Far from being the threat that many people think open access is; I think the future looks very encouraging for the open access swan that is the Humanities and Social Sciences.

A nice article—except that it also mostly ignores more than two decades of OA publishing in HSS, most of it without APCs and across a broad range of disciplines.

Action

This group includes various comments on specific actions people are taking—or might take—on behalf of open access.

Lately I've been trying to…

This one—begun on February 27, 2013 by Catherine Pellegrino—is neither a blog post, an article nor a press release. It's a thread on Friendfeed. I originally planned to tag it as background material, since I usually assume that social network interactions are, while not private, a little less public. But when I mentioned that in the thread (and some others had noted how helpful they were finding the thread), Catherine said this:

> Walt, you can point to it directly if you want; I posted it in a public forum. And Heather, Sarah, anyone else: if using this material, either quoting it or paraphrasing it or whatever, would help you in communicating with various communities, by all means please do so.

Which is great, because I think this is a worthwhile discussion and good way to start this section. Catherine begins with a multipart comment:

> Lately I've been trying to figure out where to submit the article I've been working on for the last year

and a bit, and suddenly I have a lot more sympathy for some of the things faculty do and the choices they make. I've identified five potential journals whose scopes match the topic of the article to a greater or lesser degree:

Journal A is from Taylor & Francis. I can pay them several thousand dollars I don't have to make the article OA, or I can put it in an IR (which I also don't have) or a subject repo (which I could do). They strongly urge me to transfer my copyright, but don't appear to absolutely require it.

Journal B is from Springer. I can pay them several thousand dollars I don't have to make the article OA, or I can put it in an IR (also don't have) or self-archive it, but only after a 12-month embargo. They appear to require me to transfer my copyright.

Journal C is from Elsevier. I've signed on to Cost of Knowledge, so that's a no-go.

Journal D appears to be published by a scholarly society of sorts. They say the initial review process takes 5 months. My tenure portfolio is due Oct. 1 and the article isn't precisely finished yet, so that's a no-go. They also require me to transfer my copyright.

Journal E is also published by a scholarly society and has a 17% acceptance rate. Yeaaaaaah, no.

Given the choices, it's no surprise faculty do what they do. (None of these are LIS journals, by the way.)

Talk about real-world scenarios! (The article is "at the intersection of ed-psych, LIS, and distance-ed/online-learning" and Catherine may wind up submitting it to an LIS journal.)

It's tempting to say "Go. Read the discussion. You'll find it enlightening." Maybe that's right. This isn't a case where there are easy answers—rather, it's a *real* scenario that helps illustrate just how difficult "just go OA!" is, and (I believe) why moving toward a mixed environment where OA predominates is likely to take a very long time. (I believe such a mixed environment is the only plausible long-term situation and probably the most desirable. 100% OA, no matter how you define it, seems about as unlikely as 100% anything else other than death.)

Three Things Students Can Do Now to Promote Open Access

This piece by Adi Kamdar appeared February 1, 2013 on EFF's *Deeplinks Blog*. The Electronic Frontier Foundation isn't heard from all that often with regard to OA, but here's an interesting one. Kamdar highlights a non-Elsevier journal as one of the "gasp!" prices: Wiley's *Journal of Comparative Neurology*—which costs (and here's the link just in case you don't believe me or it's changed) $35,489/year

for print+online in the USA. Of a 24-issue-per-year journal. Oh, and if you just want print? Then it comes down to a mere $30,860. (Same is true if you only want online access.) It's over $36,000 in the world outside North America and Europe. (Interesting. The journal, which certainly doesn't publish 24 issues *every* year—18 each in 2012 and 2011, for example—is in Volume 521 even though it was founded in 1891 and appears to publish one volume a year. Interesting but, I suppose, irrelevant for this discussion. Still, $35,489. For 2012, that comes out to $8.23 per published page.)

Back to the article. It includes watching an 8-minute video as the lowest-level, "reach out to your professors and librarians" if you have 30 minutes, writing an op-ed for the school newspaper if you have an hour and half a dozen suggestions "if you are interested in doing more." (I wouldn't think of two EFF-related actions as the best ways to promote OA, but what do I know?) I might suggest that students might also want to learn a *little* more about OA before taking some of the other actions.

About that video…it's certainly informative (and involves a different Eisen, Michael's brother, and a real-life situation). It's also clear what model of OA they're pushing: As far as the video's concerned, although it's not said in so many words, CC BY is the *most* restrictive license suitable for OA—without *full* reuse rights, it's not OA. Perhaps not so great: Even though one of the narrators works for SPARC, this video leads you to believe that OA is entirely, 100%, only about science. Period. That's unfortunate.

Scrolling down the page is enlightening in terms of EFF's deep involvement in OA: It's *not even in the topic list*. So offering a list of six actions, two of which are basically "get more involved with EFF," looks a lot like jumping on the bandwagon.

Ethics, Archaeology, and Open Access

Eric Kansa posted this on January 16, 2013 at the *ASOR Blog*. (ASOR is the American Schools of Oriental Research.) The introduction to the post relates "renewed attention" to OA with Aaron Swartz' suicide; if true, that's sad in more than one way.

The post itself works from the Swartz case to suggest a broader risk:

Many researchers, particularly our colleagues in public, CRM, and contract archaeology or our colleagues struggling as adjunct faculty, either totally lack or regularly lose affiliations with institutions that subscribe to pay-wall resources like JSTOR. Many of these people beg logins from their friends and colleagues lucky enough to have access. Similarly, file-

sharing of copyright protected articles is routine. Email lists and other networks regularly see circulation of papers, all under legally dubious circumstances. Essentially, we have a (nearly?) criminalized underclass of researchers who bend and break rules in order to participate in their professional community. It is a perverse travesty that we've relegated essential professional communications to an quasi-legal/illegal underground, when we're supposedly a community dedicated to advancing the public good through the creation of knowledge about the past.

We have to remember, we, as a discipline work in the public interest. Public funding directly (grants) or indirectly (heritage management laws) supports, permits, and regulates our efforts. Doesn't it make more sense to remove barriers to scholarship and remove harsh legal threats to sharing research?

Of course, many would say this is utopian and not financially sustainable, and that the only way to finance high-quality publication in archaeology is through pay walls and the commoditization of our discipline's intellectual property. But commoditization has its costs. We have a model for totally privatized and commoditized archaeology that is "financially sustainable" in that it does not require any input of public or philanthropic funding. It's called the antiquities trade. And it is ugly and destructive.

There's more—both in the initial post and in a series of updates at its end. One includes a letter from Fred Limp, president of the Society for American Archaeology, discussing SAA's position on OA. Limp introduces a new term: "open access discovery." What's that? The ability to discover *papers you won't be able to read for free*. That's not open access. Period. Limp should know better. Then there's Limp's justification for SAA's policies—which basically boils down to SAA's having relatively low membership fees and, as far as I can tell, the interests of non-archaeologists not even being worth mentioning.

Part of Kansa's response:

Fred's comments reflect his perspective with regard to SAA publications. However, the SAA is but one publisher. Even if its publication costs are relatively low, archaeological discourse takes place across many, many titles, typically managed by expensive commercial publishers. Legally accessing these requires institutional affiliations to get e-Journals, JSTOR and all the rest. Though you may get a few titles with your SAA membership, researchers lacking academic affiliations are still cut-off from the great majority of scholarly discourse. Most of them are stuck with extra-legal workarounds, putting these researchers in dire legal jeopardy. While I can understand Fred's concern over financing SAA pub-

lications (and motivating membership), accepting the dysfunctions and legal dangers of pay-walls and strong intellectual property does not advance the interests of archaeologists or archaeology.

Is it immoral to hide your research behind a paywall?

While this piece by Mike Taylor was posted on January 25, 2013 at *SV-POW*, it links to a *Guardian* article from a week earlier in which he states his answer fairly boldly: "Hiding your research behind a paywall is immoral."

That *Guardian* piece contains a rather nice little set of myths-and-responses, including (yeah Mike!) a response to "But this paywalled journal's subscription fees fund its scholarly society…" which I'm compelled to quote:

No. This is the tail wagging the dog. The purpose of a scholarly society is to promote scholarship, which is best done by making that scholarship available. A society that cares more about preserving its own budget than about the field it supposedly supports has lost its way. Societies need to find other ways to fund their activities. And yes, I am talking to you, Society of Vertebrate Paleontology (my own field's society). You cannot support the science of vertebrate palaeontology by taking science and hiding it where most people can't see it. [Emphasis added.]

I encourage you to read the article and *maybe* even the comments. Carefully. Now, back to the blog post, which partly responds to a follow-up piece by Chris Chambers, "Those who publish research behind paywalls are victims not perpetrators." Taylor takes pains to differentiate between the person and the act: He's not labeling scientists as immoral, he's labeling *actions* as immoral:

The intention of my original article was not to say that the individuals who allow their work to go behind paywalls are immoral people, but that the act it itself immoral. If that feels like a fine distinction, it's not. For a variety of pragmatic reasons, essentially moral people commit immortal acts all the time. At the trivial end of the scale, something as insignificant as not bothering to sort the recycling; at the other end, while no-one would claim dropping atomic bombs on civilian populations is an essentially moral act, many people would accept that in the context of WWII, the Hiroshima and Nagasaki bombs were justified or even necessary. (And please: no-one cite this as "Mike says publishing behind a paywall is exactly like nuking civilians"!)

Taylor's not backing off his original argument:

To summarise the intent of my article: the decision of where to publish is a moral one. Please, all you

moral people out there, make a moral choice. [Emphasis in the original.]

The discussion then goes on to the issue of journal prestige and the apparent need of younger scientists to publish in "prestigious" journals for the sake of their careers—a need that Taylor's sympathetic with, but…

> But here's what worries me about it. I hear researchers at all stages of their careers finding reasons to keep feeding paywalls. Early career researchers say "Well, I'm just getting started, I have to establish my reputation first". People who are running their own labs say "I have to aim for prestige, for the sake of my students". Long-established senior figures are in most cases still sceptical of this new-fangled open access thing (and indeed of anything not printed on paper).

Taylor also asks the question that immediately came to *my* mind when I read Chambers' article title:

> Chris's article says that people who publish behind paywalls are victims rather than perpetrators; but if they are victims, then who are they victims of? The very same system that they are part of. They are both victims and perpetrators.

> Folks, we as an academic community are doing this to ourselves.

There are 45 comments—quite a few of them *long* and in some cases argumentative. I honestly didn't read through all of them; you might find them interesting.

No More Half-measures: Anthropology must Take Responsibility for Open Access

That's by Andrew Asher, [appearing February 5, 2013](#) on *Open Access Now* (which describes itself as "a team-managed, one-stop source for news, policy and current writing about open access and scholarly communication." It's from COAPI, and while it's a worthwhile source I'm more than a little leery of *any* place that claims to be a "one-stop source" for OA material).

> Asher's disappointed that a new journal from the American Anthropological Association, *Open Anthropology*, will in fact consist of *old* material—and won't clearly be open access, since it allows for "perhaps 're-gating' content after a certain period of time." OA-for-a-while is even *less* truly OA than OA-after-an-embargo.

> Asher gives AAA credit for supporting Green OA and for *eventually* making *American Anthropologist* freely available (after a 35-*year* embargo period)—but AAA has also taken some strongly anti-OA actions, e.g.:

> For example, in the AAA's official response to the [Office of Science and technology Policy's (OSTP)](#)

[request for information on Public Access to Scholarly Publications](#), the AAA's then-Executive Director [William Davis III absurdly claimed](#), "We know of no research that demonstrated a problem with the existing system for making content of scholarly journals available to those who might benefit from it," and even asserted that the AAA viewed funder-mandated open access as an "unconstitutional taking of private property."

There's more here that's quite interesting (including a report, available only to AAA members, that apparently suggests that AAA's publishing program "is not sustainable even under a the current subscription-based model"). That leads up to Asher's recommendations for AAA action. Portions:

> 1. The AAA should immediately found a flagship open access journal for new anthropological research, or expand the mission of *Open Anthropology* to include new peer-reviewed content…

> 3. Depending on the outcome of #2, the AAA should begin taking steps to prepare to transition all of its journals to open access at the end of its present contract with Wiley-Blackwell.

> 4. AAA members who support open access should make it a voting issue in AAA leadership elections.

Each of those is accompanied by some expanded commentary. Here's the close:

> There should be no more half measures for the AAA. Anthropological research should be accessible for students, scholars, the people and communities where we conduct research, and the public at large, regardless of their ability to pay subscription fees or their affiliation with a library or university that can. Transitioning to open access is therefore the only tenable ethical position for the future of the AAA publishing program.

Libraries

Not that libraries haven't been mentioned before, but these pieces *specifically* address libraries.

Not just an Academic question: Why Open Access matters for public libraries

Hugh Rundle posted this [on January 16, 2013](#) on *It's Not About the Books*. It seems to be another Aaron Swartz-inspired OA post, which doesn't make it less worthwhile.

> The Open Access culture that Swartz championed can all too easily be seen by public librarians as something that doesn't concern them. Academic journals? That's for academic libraries, right? Wrong. Every public library I know of is paying for access to some kind of academic journal content. Every public library I know of wants more access to

that content. We serve a wide variety of members with a diverse range of needs. Many of them are independent adult learners, who desire access to scientific or other journal articles for any number of reasons. Why should they not have access to them?

In the US, at least, I'd guess there are quite a few public libraries that *don't* pay for access to any academic journal content, but I'd guess most of them are tiny libraries without much in the way of online subscriptions. In any case, boy, are those last three sentences pertinent to *every* public library.

Here's another excellent quote (I'm leaving out most of the discussion):

> Everything you spend money on has two costs – the cost in hard currency, and the opportunity cost. Every dollar you give to an academic publisher or aggregation company is a dollar you can't spend on something else. So when you pay to give your community access to something that they already paid for to be created, they're being screwed three times.

Yep.

Some interesting comments, including one unfortunate one that manages to combine "most people outside a field don't need access to that field's articles" with the concept that public libraries actually, truly do *select* everything they buy solely on the basis of its good quality and appropriateness for their community. Rundle's response could be summarized as "that ship sailed a long time ago"—unless you know of a public library that does not include any trashy reading material, that is.

Library publishing programs and faculty needs

This is a three-part series by Library Loon at *Gavia Libraria*, appearing on [December 5](#), 2012, [later on December 5, 2012](#), and [December 6, 2012](#). I'm quoting selectively from all three pieces. The Loon is in favor of library publishing programs—but not if they're done as "install software and forget" services.

> This rarely ends well; faculty need more than a bare Open Journal Systems install, and without a clear sense of service boundaries, libraries have been known to find themselves stuck catering expensively to individual prima-donna editors…

Skipping over valuable stuff, we get (excerpted):

> Where both librarians and would-be journal editors tend to fall apart around publishing is their lamentable ignorance of just what the journal-publishing process *entails*. Pressfolk know all this, of course, but they tend to err on the side of assuming that everything they do is vital to the process because they do it. The truth, as always, lies someplace between these extremes.

So let's take the problem apart this way: Faculty know about and will ask libraries for some pieces of the publishing process. They don't know about other parts; some of those parts they will quickly realize they need, some they'll never miss….

A few journal-level sine qua nons, first: Any half-decent journal will want an attractive, usable, distinctive web presence… Libraries: don't start a journal-publishing program without web-design expertise on tap, and if you're using OJS, you probably want to be able to call on a PHP hacker as well. Willingness to purchase and manage a domain name for the journal is a good idea.

The Loon doesn't think journal marketing is that big a deal, but that a library publishing program *should* know how to submit new journals to the appropriate subject-area indexes and mailing lists. She also thinks that such programs should buy into DOIs as well. (As she notes, ISSNs go without saying: It's so *easy* to get an ISSN for an ejournal.)

Then she traces the process of an article, and here things start to get more detailed and even more valuable, enough so that I really believe you should read the Loon's own (experienced) words. In summary, you need to acquire papers, gather submissions, do an editorial once-over, assign peer reviewers and manage the review process and do two levels of editing:

> Next comes editing, one of the commonest disjoints between library publishing programs and faculty. Speaking quite broadly and largely inaccurately, editing comes in two varieties: content editing, which asks all the hard questions about the content of the article, and copyediting, which cleans up spelling, grammar, ambiguity, and lack of clarity, as well as checking mechanical issues such as figure/table numbering and adherence to house citation style and other house rules.

> Faculty with the gumption to start a new journal are in the Loon's experience often willing to undertake content editing. "Often" is not "always," however; sometimes they want funding for Someone Else (often a put-upon graduate student) to do it. As for copyediting, which is time-consuming and finicky work—even faculty *willing* to do it are frequently *unable*, due to time constraints or even flat incompetence…

Part two adds "a few more words on copyediting," and they're good words.

Then there's production—which can mean some combination of HTML, PDF online, PDF for print and XML. It means, in one way or another, the digital equivalent of typesetting. Expanding again:

If there's a production process more honored in the breach than typesetting, the Loon doesn't know what it is. Honestly, faculty and librarians alike believe it happens by magic. If they don't get adequate typesetting, though, First World faculty absolutely will realize they're missing it, and demand it. (Faculty in developing nations are less picky, which is partly how InTech has stayed in business so long despite its deplorably incompetent typesetting.) Some faculty are sloppy enough not to miss even copyediting; *none* will overlook a double-spaced Word document that resembles an undergraduate paper masquerading as a professionally-produced article.

This is, fundamentally, why university presses find so many library publishing efforts risible. The presses are entirely correct to laugh. Adequate typesetting is a basic journal-quality heuristic, far more fundamental than (because operating on deeper and less-conscious prejudices than) impact factor or anything else bibliometric. Libraries: get this right, or just plain quit pretending. The Loon is as serious about this as she knows how to be. *No publishing services without basic design and typesetting.*

No, the Loon isn't saying you need InDesign or Quark. She's saying, *correctly*, that even using Word for layout and typesetting takes time and effort. Heck, I've written a book that's largely about that time and effort—and I ducked some of the really hard issues. And as she says:

> (Typesetting in Word without styles? Timesink. The Loon guarantees it.)

I can't imagine. Well, I can, but I'd rather not. There's a lot more here that I'm not including; *go read it*. The Loon winds up recommending PDF for library publishing services, and I suspect she's right.

The third piece of this estimable—and in my opinion *must-read*—series says that, yes, there is a place for library publishing programs. But…

> Libraries taking this road, however, need to understand why they're doing it, what its limitations are, and that visible returns on investment may be years away, before they embark.

And here's where it gets even more interesting, as what the Loon suggests is that the library publishing program go *beyond* peer-reviewed journals and monographs to all that other stuff:

> Quite a few ersatz "publishing" enterprises exist on the typical college or university campus, wholly outside the peer-reviewed-journal space. Student journals and literary magazines. Small conferences, who might "publish a proceedings" if they could do so cheaply and relatively easily, and whose production standards aren't high—some in the Loon's experience

are even willing to archive untouched presenter manuscripts and/or slidedecks. Working-papers series, or tech-report collections. Chapbooks (though poets tend to be persnickety about typography, so beware). Applied journals and other shoestring publications that don't run the peer-review gauntlet.

She calls it "serving the underserved" and I think she has an excellent strategy:

> The immediate goals are to *accumulate publishing expertise in the library*, to *build a campus following*, and to *design a viable service profile*. None of these will happen right away, of course, but they're where to start. Don't know how to design or typeset print? Wait for the inevitable design-savvy undergraduate working for the undergraduate literary magazine to teach you; she might even build a house design and Word stylesheet for you, if you can find sufficient incentive for her to do so. Can't get faculty to pay attention to your program? Word-of-mouth works. It's nearly the only thing that *does*.

That's the last bit I'm going to excerpt. Might I add that larger public libraries could also—and maybe *should* also—consider such programs? For very small libraries, I believe *The Librarian's Guide to Micropublishing* will serve your needs; the jump from there to an actual publishing program is a fairly large one that does require resources.

Pay What You Wish

Cites & Insights carries no advertising and has no sponsorship. It does have costs, both direct and indirect. If you find it valuable or interesting, you are invited to contribute toward its ongoing operation. The Paypal donation button (for which you can use Paypal or a credit card) is on the *Cites & Insights* home page. Thanks.

Masthead