



Open Access: Future Planning

Criteria Discussion

Presenters: Tony Horava, Pamela Jacobs,
Denise Koufogiannakis, and Peter Webster

CRKN  RCDR

Canadian Research Knowledge Network
Réseau canadien de documentation pour la recherche

Agenda

- Introduction & Context
- Larger picture
- Overview of the current landscape
- Criteria
- Discussion (after the break)



Introduction & Context

Introduction

As Open Access (OA) continues to grow, CRKN is frequently faced with decisions on which OA initiatives to support. As there are many different projects, initiatives, models, and approaches, CRKN needs to be strategic in what is supported to ensure the projects reflect member library priorities, as well as the larger strategic goals of CRKN and the Canadian academic library community.

The Content Strategy Committee would like to have a discussion with the membership and receive input on which criteria should be used in evaluating how suitable an OA initiative may be for CRKN.

Context

As a committee, the CSC has been tasked with:

- Reviewing and making recommendations to the Board regarding the overall direction of the CRKN content program;
- Ensuring meaningful consultation with regard to members' priorities;
- Developing objectives, principles, strategies, and specifications for vendor and open access negotiations and license agreements, for recommendation to the Board as appropriate.

From the CSC Terms of Reference

Context

When OA initiatives are suggested to CRKN, either by members or by those involved in the projects, they often end up in front of the Content Strategy Committee (CSC) for evaluation, the same way other content-related proposals are reviewed.

The CSC has been evaluating and making recommendations on what to pursue, but is looking for more guidance from the membership regarding what criteria to use, and the relative level of importance of each one.

Larger Picture

- This is the beginning of a conversation. We do not expect to come to definitive answers in this session
- The overall strategic direction of CRKN is the responsibility of the Board of Directors, and this will feed into recommendations that the CSC will provide to the Board of Directors on a larger open access strategy

From the 2013-16 Strategic Plan:

Strategic Objective 2.0

“CRKN will continue to support, strengthen and evaluate existing licenses, while developing and implementing a systematic process to identify and respond to the diverse and evolving content needs of CRKN members. We will assist our membership to meet the evolving needs of its stakeholders by offering new infrastructure and additional services, and **by expanding its role in the scholarly communication life cycle by developing a systematic way to support open access publishing.**”



Overview of the current landscape

Overview of the current landscape

Berlin 12/OA2020 initiative

- Proposal for large-scale transition of journals to OA, by conversion of current subscription spending to APCs

SCOAP³

- Phase 2 renewal is complete
- CRKN has signed the MoU addendum to confirm our ongoing participation
- Conversion of commercial journals to OA through transitioning subscription spending to OA support on an international scale

Érudit Partnership

- Collaborative partnership approach
- Transforming subscription fees into funds to support the journals in making the content OA

Overview of the current landscape

- Recently identified a range of services & content providers that support scholarly open access publishing in different ways
- Identified resources which are seeking support from institutions
- Many are already supported by Canadian academic libraries & consortia

Open access service pricing models

- Open access services use a range of pricing models as they seek financial sustainability.
- Services include both non-profit & for-profit initiatives.
- Options often include:
 - institutional membership, sponsorship, or one-time support.
 - Sometimes in exchange for premium services.
 - Often in addition to author fees, and other funding avenues.

Open Access Journals & Publishers	Canadian members
BioMed Central,	<u>17</u>
Frontiers	<u>2</u>
Open Library of Humanities (OJH)	<u>11</u>
PeerJ	<u>3</u>
Public Library of Science (PLOS)	<u>3</u>

Open Access Pre-print Repositories	Canadian members
ArXiv	<u>5</u>
PhilPapers	<u>59</u>
Social Science Research Network (SSRN)	<u>19</u>

Open Access Publishing Initiatives	Canadian members
Public Knowledge Project (PKP)	<u>19</u>
Scholarly Publishing and Academic Resources (SPARC)	<u>19</u>

Other Open Access Initiatives	Canadian members
Directory of Open Access Journals (DOAJ)	<u>33</u>
Confederation of Open Access Repositories (COAR)	<u>4 (32 via CARL) 36</u>
DuraSpace (software foundation)	<u>16</u>



Criteria

Criteria

The following are some of the criteria that the CSC has informally been using, or has considered:

Funding model & sustainability of model:

- Which models (eg. APCs, directly funding journals, other) are preferable? Does the initiative have a solid sustainability plan?

Geography:

- Should preference be given to Canadian initiatives?
- Should we align ourselves with international initiatives?

Criteria

Consortial advantage:

- Should preference be given to initiatives where there is a clear advantage (financial or otherwise) to consortial involvement (compared to individual institutions participating on their own)?

Quantity:

- Should preference be given to larger initiatives, rather than individual (or very small packages) of journals/ebooks/other content?

Status of organization coordination initiative:

- Should preference be given to not-for-profit initiatives?

Criteria

New content vs. converting existing:

- Should preference be given to initiatives to convert current journals (or ebooks) to open access, rather than creating new journals that require new funds (compared to converting existing funds)?

Established initiative vs. new initiative:

- Should preference be given to one over the other? For established initiatives, there is potentially less risk, but there may be more possibility of consortial value for initiatives that are just starting

Principled/idealistic approach vs. pragmatic approach:

- Revamping the entire system (e.g. completely new models) vs. meeting the researchers where they are (e.g. models that allow authors to continue to publish in 'traditional' journals)

Criteria

Current level of support among membership:

- How should this be factored in? A large number of participants could mean it is a suitable project, but may mean there is not a lot of value being added by CRKN. If few are currently supporting, does that mean it is perhaps not of interest? Or is it because libraries haven't found a suitable way to get involved?

Strategic elements and future plans for the project:

- How should “larger picture” aspects of an initiative be evaluated?



Break

Breakout Session: Discussion

At your tables, please discuss the criteria that should be used for evaluating whether or not CRKN should support a particular OA initiative. Which criteria are the most important to consider? Are there other criteria that should be added?

- Please take notes that reflect your discussion. These notes will be passed along to the CSC.
- Each table will be asked to report back **one key piece of feedback that you would like the CSC to have** (limited to 1-2 minutes per table).

Discussion (20 minutes)

Please discuss the criteria that should be used for evaluating whether or not CRKN should support a particular OA initiative. Which criteria are the most important to consider? Are there other criteria that should be added?

- Sustainability/funding model
- Geography
- Consortial advantage
- Quantity
- Status of organization coordinating initiative
- New content vs. converting existing
- Established initiative vs. new initiative
- Principled/idealistic approach vs. pragmatic approach
- Current level of support among membership
- Strategic elements and future plans for the project
- Other criteria to consider?

Thank you!

- Thank you for participating in the discussion
- Notes taken at the tables will be collected and collated for the Content Strategy Committee to review at their next meeting
- Input from today's session will feed into recommendations that the CSC will provide to the Board of Directors on a larger open access strategy



Further comments, questions, and feedback
can be sent to Monica Ward (mward@crkn.ca)