

Open Access: Getting on the Same Page: What if IR Managers and OA Policy Administrators Could Have Everything They Desire From Publishers?

John G. Dove
Paloma & Associates, johngdove@gmail.com

Author ORCID Identifier: 0000-0003-4648-7881

Follow this and additional works at: <https://docs.lib.purdue.edu/charleston>

An indexed, print copy of the Proceedings is also available for purchase at:

<http://www.thepress.purdue.edu/series/charleston>.

You may also be interested in the new series, Charleston Insights in Library, Archival, and Information Sciences. Find out more at: <http://www.thepress.purdue.edu/series/charleston-insights-library-archival-and-information-sciences>.

John G. Dove, "Open Access: Getting on the Same Page: What if IR Managers and OA Policy Administrators Could Have Everything They Desire From Publishers?" (2017). *Proceedings of the Charleston Library Conference*.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.5703/1288284316699>

Open Access: Getting on the Same Page: What if IR Managers and OA Policy Administrators Could Have Everything They Desire From Publishers?

Moderated by John G. Dove, Consultant, Paloma & Associates

Directors of scholarly communication and others responsible for institutional policies with regard to repositories and open access have an increasingly complex landscape to manage. University presses, even those with a strong support for open access, often have subscription journals. Are there areas where these subscription journals can follow OA-friendly practices that can help the IR managers and OA policy administrators? If so, maybe these can be practices that other journal publishers can be pressured to provide?

We bring together three panelists from research universities with diverse responsibilities of administering an open access policy, managing an institutional repository, and managing journal publishing to discuss what features and terms can reasonably be expected of publishers to support open access.

Topics at this Lively Lunch and discussion include: What can publishers do to simplify the administration of IRs? What terms could be clarified so that authors who share their submitted manuscripts can do so with confidence that they are not afoul of publisher restrictions? What terms should cover data so that universities can archive not just articles but sufficient data to allow independent review and evaluation of research results?

Panelists were:

- **Ivy Anderson**, Associate Executive Director and Director of Collections, California Digital Library
- **Toni Gunnison**, University of Wisconsin Press
- **Yuan Li**, Scholarly Communications Librarian, Princeton University Library

Leading up to the Lively Lunch and following on afterward, participants had access to a GoogleDoc that gathered suggested items for a wish list for publishers. This list does not represent any sort of consensus of the panelists nor attendees, but does provide examples of what some participants would want to see.

My thanks to the panelists and audience for a lively discussion, and particular thanks to Peter Suber, who kicked off the list to which numerous people added their inputs. The GoogleDoc is still available and updatable at <http://goo.gl/VJTbo5>

John Dove

IR Managers', OA Policy Administrators', and Scholarly Communication Officers' Wish List for Scholarly Publishers

1. Licensing and Permissions
 - a. Allow the author to share the author's version of an article (usually the accepted author manuscript or AAM):
 - i. In an institutional repository
 - ii. In a subject or disciplinary repository
 - iii. Without an embargo
 - iv. Without paying a fee
 - v. With an open license, preferably a CC-BY license
2. Formats
 - a. Never publish in PDF-only. Always offer at least one alternative file format, preferably more than one. For example:
 - i. HTML
 - ii. XML
 - iii. ePub
3. Technologies
 - a. Autodeposit the accepted author manuscript (AAM) in the author's IR.
 - i. Do this for every coauthor.
 - ii. Do this preferably at the time of acceptance but no later than the time of publication.
 - iii. Be flexible about methods for doing it, for example, SWORD, FTP, Dropbox, e-mail attachment, and so on.

- iv. Include metadata for the article including:
 1. ORCIDs
 2. DOI
- v. Provide links to datasets associated with the article for possible inclusion in the IR.
- vi. Update the accepted author manuscript (AAM) to the version of record (VOR) after any embargo period.
- vii. If you do have an embargo period, do not have different embargoes for differing geographies (such as country where author resides).
- viii. Provide retraction notifications to the IR should the article be retracted.
- b. Publish an RSS feed (and/or Atom feed and/or JSON feed) for the table of contents.
- c. Support annotation tools like Hypothesis.
- d. Support batch downloading for text mining.
- e. Support multimedia (even if you don't require multimedia).
- f. Support altmetrics, including article-level metrics.
- 4. Other
 - a. For authors who work at institutions with an opt-out or rights-retention OA policy (aka Harvard-style policy), don't require them to opt out as a condition of publication.
 - b. If you are a hybrid journal, do not double-dip (charge twice for the OA articles). Prove you are not double-dipping by sharing data showing that you lower your subscription price in proportion to the uptake on the OA option.
 - c. If you are a hybrid journal, consider your hybrid status provisional and as a step toward conversion to full OA. Share your transition plans with the public.
 - d. If you are willing to enter "offset agreements" with universities, consider them as a step toward conversion to full OA. Share your transition plans with the public.
 - e. If you are a fee-based journal (hybrid or full OA), then offer fee waivers or discounts in cases of economic hardship.
 - f. If you are a fee-based journal (hybrid or full OA), then don't charge higher fees for less restrictive open licenses, like CC-BY.
 - g. Require all authors to obtain ORCIDs as a condition of publication. Then display the ORCID along with the author's name in the byline and metadata.
 - h. If you publish an article that rests on a dataset created by the authors, then require the dataset to be OA no later than the date of publication.
 - i. If you don't require open data, at least make your data access policy clear.
 - j. Welcome the submission of preprints. Don't exclude the consideration of preprints. Don't follow the Ingelfinger rule.
 - k. Make sure all your articles, including your non-OA articles, are full-text searchable by major search engines (such as Google and Google Scholar) as well as the various library discovery and recommendation systems.
 - l. If you are a hybrid journal, be sure to follow the NISO Recommended Practice for Access License and Indicators.
 - m. In particular, mark your hybrid open articles as <free_to_read> and insist that your discovery tools, or those that you allow to index your content, are acting on that indicator to make this article discoverable and readable by users who may not have a subscription to your journal.
 - n. Show multiple dates for each article: date of submission, date of acceptance, and date of publication.

- o. If images in the text are low-res or med-res, then provide high-res versions outside the text.
- p. Publish articles as they are accepted. Don't wait for the next "issue." Don't add artificial delays.
- q. Experiment with open or postpublication peer review.
- r. Make sure that Sherpa/Romeo has up-to-date information about both the publisher and the journals—and strive for all "green."
- s. For open access journals: Make sure the journal qualifies and is listed in the DOAJ.
- t. For open access publishers: Make sure you qualify and have joined OASPA.
- u. Implement the NISO KBART Recommended Practices.
- v. Declare your support for COUNTER-compliance and follow the COUNTER Code of Practice (even if you are an open access publisher).