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Librarians as Advocates for Scholarly Authors:
A Presentation and a Dramatization

Sue Ann Gardner, University of Nebraska-Lincoln

NEBRASKA LIBRARY ASSOCIATION CONFERENCE
Kearney, Nebraska, October 10, 2013
Know the issues

Scholarly authors today are faced with unprecedented choices and, paradoxically, increasing barriers to publication. For example, the author-pays financial model of funding open access (also sometimes called Gold OA) is one of many such innovations that thwart authors who are not currently Federally funded or otherwise sponsored. As academic librarians, we need to be aware of the scholarly publishing infrastructure so we can advise authors how to make decisions about where to publish, what terms to agree to, and how to best leverage their written scholarly output.

Scholarship first

Regarding the scholarly publishing financial market, I will describe how, effectively, the “tail wags the dog,” and cover how the proper primary focus should be facile scholarly communication, and that financial models should remain of secondary concern, which is contrary to the prevailing current environment.

The goal--
Facile scholarly communication
About today’s presentation

The presentation part of my session will be in a standard lecture format, but then I will wrap up the talk with a dramatization of two example publishing scenarios that directly affect authors’ ability to communicate with their peers, students, and the public. I will show one scenario that is publisher-centric, and another that is author-centric, and show how each impacts scholarly communication. My intention is that this will be entertaining, informative, and thought-provoking.
How can you advise authors about publishing?

Relevant concerns--

- METRICS / ALTMETRICS
- COPYRIGHT
- PUBLISHERS’ POLICIES
- PREDATORY PUBLISHING
- NOT-FOR-PROFIT OPEN ACCESS PUBLISHING
- REPOSITORIES
Author Advocacy

The measure of impact of a work is changing

- Journal Impact Factor is still important in some cases
- Journal Eigenfactor
- H Index
- G Index
- Repository download reports
- Google Analytics / Google Scholar Citations
- Et al.
Author Advocacy

Many issues to consider...

COPYRIGHT

- Help authors decipher publishing agreements

- Traditional copyright protects authors well if they retain their rights

- Use Creative Commons licenses knowingly--they absolutely are not for all authors in all situations

- Advise against using the SPARC addendum

“What does that even mean?”

Image courtesy East Texas Baptist University
The SPARC Addendum

- Well-intentioned, the SPARC addendum will likely lead nowhere for authors

- It puts the author in a David vs. Goliath situation

- Some highly-productive authors may be able to negotiate revised publishing agreements
Author Advocacy

COPYRIGHT

- Copyright (ownership of content) vs. Copyleft (content is free / reader-centric)

- Orphan works

Read about at: http://www.edwardsamuels.com/copyright/beyond/articles/Orphan%20Works.htm

- Fair use

PUBLISHERS’ POLICIES

Use SHERPA/RoMEO to begin investigating publishers’ policies

Publishers allow authors to retain varying degrees of rights:

- Author retains all rights to re-use the work in any form
- Author can re-use the manuscript only (pre- or post-peer review)
- Author must ask permission to re-use the work in some form
- Author retains no rights to re-use the work (only fair use)
- Author must publish under a certain Creative Commons license

http://www.sherpa.ac.uk/romeo/
Gold Open Access vs. Green Open Access

We are often presented with false choices--

Gold, Green, it’s all about the needs of the publisher

• Author-pays (i.e. Gold OA): WHO GETS THE MONEY?

THE PUBLISHER

• WHAT DO WE GET IN RETURN?

Authors and reviewers do the work for free, plus we have to pay for the content and we have decreased access

• Problem with Green OA: “Versions of record” not allowed in IRs

Many commercial, society, and institutional publishers only allow author versions in institutional repositories. Manuscript versions are not the version of record. The published version needs to be cited. We are settling for an inadequate system.

Green OA manuscripts are a decoy that lead to the high-cost published versions

Gold = GOUGE
Green = GRAY

Green OA leads to a subset of GRAY LITERATURE

Author Advocacy
A rainbow of pseudo-access...
Scholarly Journal Publishing Variables Matrix

Sue Ann Gardner

Assumption: all peer-reviewed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Open access fee</th>
<th>Page charges</th>
<th>No charges</th>
<th>Free to access</th>
<th>Costs to access</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full open access(^a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full open access(^a) with embargo period</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial open access(^b)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial open access(^b) with embargo period</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable open access(^c)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closed access(^d)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quick publishing(^e)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widely distributed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well-indexed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remuneration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prestigious (as determined by metrics(^f))</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prestigious (as determined by low acceptance rate)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Society or institutional publisher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both print and online available</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online-only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: "open access" in this context means no charge to read by anyone with Internet access

\(^a\) Published version in institutional repository
\(^b\) Manuscript (pre-print or post-print) in institutional repository
\(^c\) Published or manuscript (pre-print or post-print) version in institutional repository when permission is granted on a case-by-case basis
\(^d\) No version allowed in institutional repository
\(^e\) Published within four months of submission
\(^f\) Metrics include journal impact factor, author H-index, etc.
PREDATORY PUBLISHING

Some criteria

• Recently-established publishing operations
• Charge open access fees
• Exist primarily to exploit the academic publishing market
• Also includes fraudulent outfits that involve dishonest practices such as promising peer review when none occurs

Karen Coyle, thoughtful assessment of predatory publishing in *Library Journal* (http://lj.libraryjournal.com/2013/04/opinion/peer-to-peer-review/predatory-publishers-peer-to-peer-review/)

Information about which journals are open access:

- Directory of Open Access Journals (http://doaj.org)

- Use the DOAJ with care

Some publishers listed may be--or at least border on--predatory, and some of these journals charge authors high open access fees.
Create open access content in the library or other academic department:

- **Journals** can be hosted
  - **Within institutional repositories**
    - Use tools such as CrossRef (for DOIs), Portico (for backup), etc.
  - **Using a journal hosting service** such as Open Journal Systems or Editorial Manager

- **YES --> Even books** can be published within the library
Author Advocacy

NOT-FOR-PROFIT OPEN ACCESS PUBLISHING

Examples of Zea E-Books published by the University of Nebraska-Lincoln Libraries

Images courtesy University of Nebraska-Lincoln
REPOSITORIES--TYPES

- Institutional
  Platforms include DigitalCommons (*proprietary*), DSpace and Fedora (*open source*)

- Federal
  An example is PubMed Central (*includes an open access subset*)

- Subject
  Examples include arXiv and Social Science Research Network (SSRN)

- Social
  Examples include ResearchGate and Mendeley
Author Advocacy

INSTITUTIONAL REPOSITORIES

- Mediated deposit vs. Self-archiving
- Mandates further usurp control from authors
- Are just one means to open access to scholarly literature

Federated searching of repositories is available at http://www.base-search.net/

Federated searching of DigitalCommons repositories is available at http://network.bepress.com/
Visit UNL’s repository:

DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska-Lincoln

http://digitalcommons.unl.edu

http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/zea/

Paul Royster, PhD

Sue Gardner, MLS
Author Advocacy

The ideal would include...

Author-Centric Model

Supply infrastructure to support posting of published versions of articles with no embargo period

Allow the author to retain copyright (\(\sim\) full rights of use post-publishing and no embargoes)

Recognize the right of authors to retain copyright (copyleft)

Host an IR, though do not mandate deposit to the IR

- Funding agencies
- Readers
- Author's home institution
- Publishers

AUTHOR
DRAMATIZATION

Publisher-centric scenario

Author-centric scenario
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