



New Funding Models for Scholarly Communication: BRII and SCOAP³

LAUC Statewide Meeting
University of California, Irvine
May 7, 2008

Chuck Eckman
Associate University Librarian, Director of Collections
University of California, Berkeley
ceckman@library.berkeley.edu





global context

- commercialization of scholarly discourse
- growth of author/producer-paid models
- ensuring continuity in the “pluralist phase” of scholarly communication





UC faculty attitudes & behaviors

- 93% say impact factor is important in choosing a publication venue
- 75% are aware of journal pricing crisis
- 73% indicate change in scholarly communication system is needed (26% say "substantial" change is needed in their discipline)
- 70% say journal affordability is not a factor in choosing a publication venue





UC faculty attitudes & behaviors

- 63% agree that the existing peer review process discourages new forms of high-quality peer-reviewed publishing
- 54% say high price of journals mitigates the impact of their research
- 23% say their OA publishing will increase in the next twelve months
- 22% say they have published in an open access venue





Berkeley Research Impact Initiative: BRII





basics

- co-sponsored by Vice Chancellor for Research and University Librarian
- subsidizes OA publication charges (capped at \$3000)
- subsidizes 'paid access' charges (capped at \$1500)
- faculty, grads and post-docs
- 18-month trial / began January 2008



©Cartoonbank.com



"It's this marvelous little liberal-arts college in Kansas that gives frequent-flier miles."



2005 Berkeley faculty conference

"If Berkeley faculty are to change their behavior, the campus must be willing to provide individuals with start up funds. Faculty interested in establishing new, open-access journals could use campus seed money to offset editorial and technical costs. Similarly, the campus could provide funding support for scholars who wish to publish in open-access publications that charge author fees."

-Executive Summary of the Faculty Conference on Scholarly Publishing, March 2005





“open” movement

- growth of OA journals and their impact
- “hybrid” journal phenomenon
 - embargo 6-18 months
 - “paid access” fees / author discretion
- stewardship of campus resources
 - impact on journal subscriptions
 - leveraging memberships effectively
 - disciplinary funding inequities





goals

- promote Berkeley-based research
- support those faculty who chose to publish in “open” venues
- encourage sustainable OA and “open” publishing models
- ensure library collections cost efficiencies
 - earn credits for paid access fees
 - promote awareness and use of OA membership benefits/publishing discounts
- understand the impact of open publishing on campus-wide budgeting





issues confronted during development

- precedents
- partnership: library/research office
- cost
- definition of open access
- peer review
- academic staff





issues confronted during rollout

- researchers
- conference proceedings
- page charges
- grant funding





status

- 11 approved requests:
 - 5 open access requests (Oxford, BMC, PLoS)
 - 6 paid access requests (Oxford, PNAS, Blackwell, Magnolia, American Society for Plant Biology, European Geosciences Union)
- recipient status: 4 Professors; 3 Asst. Professors; 3 Post Doc; 1 Grad
- departments: Integrative Biology (3); Plant and Microbial Biology (2); Psychology (2); Chemistry (1); Earth Sciences (1); Education (1); Environmental Science & Policy Management (1)





next steps

- promotion
- approach publishers
- knowledge base development
- campus publishing data analysis





Sponsoring Consortium on Open Access Publishing in Particle Physics: SCOAP³





International high-energy physics (HEP) community

- laboratories
- individual libraries & consortia
- scientific institutes
- governments
- publishers





convert HEP publishing to OA

- small core of high impact journals (6 titles yield 80% of literature)
- fully convert 5 HEP journals
- convert 1 additional 'broadband journal'
- mix of commercial and society publishers





funding model

- institutions redirect their subscription funds toward consortium
- consortium serves mediating role
 - aggregates funds
 - issues tenders to publishers to handle publishing and peer review functions
 - representing authors (leverages author choice)





potential for cost control

- eliminate marketing/sales costs
- reduce subscriber transaction costs
- stabilize overall expenditure
- governance structure to help enforce cost control





rescuing peer review

- arXiv is access point for HEP researchers and scientists
- libraries have little incentive not to cancel
- journals at risk





phased transition outline

1. Stakeholders estimate their current expenditure on the HEP journals targeted by SCOAP³ [*no money changes hands*]
2. Stakeholders pledge to redirect their current spend to SCOAP3 through an Expression of Interest [*no money changes hands*]
3. Once a sizeable fraction of budget is pledged, SCOAP³ issues a tender to publishers [*no money changes hands*]
4. Publishers answer the tender. Formal agreement on:
 - Journal license packages are un-bundled, the OA titles are removed and subscription prices are reduced accordingly
 - In the case of long-term subscription contracts, publishers will be required to reimburse subscription costs pertaining to OA journals [*no money changes hands*]
5. SCOAP³ partners establish the Consortium, decide on the governance, adjudicate contracts and commit funds [*no money changes hands*]
6. Contracts with publisher are signed and funds are transferred to SCOAP³
7. **Payments happen!**





summary

- both initiatives embrace the author/producer-pays model, at different scales
- both aim to be nondisruptive
- both move the library into a different part of the information production 'food chain'
- BRII is incremental and responsive to individual author choices
- SCOAP³ visibly transformative on a global, disciplinary level
- stay tuned





references

- Faculty Survey. UC Office of Scholarly Communication
<http://osc.universityofcalifornia.edu/responses/activities.html>
- Joe Esposito, "Open Access 2.0" The Scientist 21:11 (November 2007)p.52.
<http://www.the-scientist.com/article/home/53781/>
- Faculty Conference on Scholarly Publishing .March 2005. Executive Summary.
<http://www.lib.berkeley.edu/scholarlypublishing/>
- SCOAP³ Working Party Report
<http://www.scoap3.org/files/Scoap3ExecutiveSummary.pdf>
- Ivy Anderson, "The Audacity of SCOAP"
<http://www.arl.org/resources/pubs/br/br257.shtml>
- SCOAP³ US Focal Meeting. February 29, 2008. Berkeley.
<http://www.scoap3.org/news/news28.html>

