

OPEN ACCESS MADE EASY?

Helena Francke

University of Borås

helena.francke@hb.se

NordILL 2018, Umeå, 12 october 2018



UNIVERSITY
OF BORÅS

Acknowledging the other participants in the SC evaluation group: Henrik Aldberg, Swedish Research Council; Ulf Kronman, National Library of Sweden; Camilla Lindelöw, National Library of Sweden; Lisa Olsson, Stockholm University (coordinator) and Niklas Willén, Uppsala University. Thomas Neidenmark for the survey.

BACKGROUND

Targets

Open access to scholarly publications should be the standard in the EU from 2020.

The Swedish government's “target is that all scholarly publications which are the result of publicly funded research should become open access at the time of publishing.”

(Prop. 2016/17:50; my transl.)

Current state in Sweden

Around 30-40 % of journal and conference articles made OA, c. 10-20 % through gold or hybrid OA

Kronman, U. (2017). Open Access i SwePub 2010-2016. National Library of Sweden.

European Commission (2018). Trends for open access to publications. [Based on Scopus data, 2016 via Open Science Monitor]

INITIATIVES

National Library of Sweden has been instructed by the government to coordinate the “work of introducing principles for open access publishing” (OpenAccess.se, Coordination of Open Access to Research Publications in Sweden)

See and comment on drafts of the reports by the National Library working groups:
<http://openaccess.blogg.kb.se/>

Funders initiative through cOAlition S (Sept. 2018)

→ OA is included in the Swedish consortia negotiations with publishers

INTERIM AND OFFSET AGREEMENTS

Pure offset agreements: an organization's license-/subscription costs with a publisher is lowered in relation to how much affiliated researchers have paid in APCs the previous year. May also result in a lowering of subscription costs for all subscribers.

Read & Publish agreements: the organization pays a publishing cost for affiliated authors' work to become OA and a reading cost to get access to subscription material

Partnerships and memberships: organizations team up to achieve OA to journals (e.g. SCOAP³) or affiliated authors get lower APCs due to the organization's membership in an agreement.

Olsson, L. et al. (2017). Utvärdering av offset-avtal : delrapport 2: Springer Compact och Institute of Physics. p. 5.
<http://openaccess.blogg.kb.se/files/2017/09/Utva%CC%88rdering-av-offset-avtal-SC-och-IOP-delrapport-2.pdf>

THE SWEDISH SPRINGER COMPACT AGREEMENT (2016-2018)

Read & Publish agreement between the Bibsam consortium (on behalf of 42 institutions) and Springer Nature

Covers

- publishing up to 4,162 articles in 1,705 hybrid journals (2,936 articles published end August 2018)
- reading of 2,110 journals on SpringerLink platform
- does not cover gold OA journals or hybrid journals that used to belong to Nature Publishing Group.

Pilot during July 2016 to December 2018

Co-funded by

- Bibsam consortium members
- National Library of Sweden
- Swedish Research Council

Olsson, L. et al. (2018). Evaluation of offset agreements – report 3: Springer Compact. <http://openaccess.blogg.kb.se/2018/02/12/evaluation-of-the-swedish-springer-compact-agreement/>

THE EVALUATION OF THE SC AGREEMENT

A group evaluates the agreement on behalf of the Bibsam consortium

- Costs
- Administration
- **Author attitudes and practices** → Survey
- Dissemination

Feb 20, 2017 to June 28, 2018

375 responses (c. 17% of possible responses)

Only authors from half of the institutions

The evaluation group:

Henrik Aldberg, Swedish Research Council

Helena Francke, University of Borås

Ulf Kronman, National Library of Sweden

Camilla Lindelöw, National Library of Sweden

Lisa Olsson, Stockholm University (coordinator)

Niklas Willén, Uppsala University

AUTHORS' REACTIONS TO OA PUBLISHING THROUGH SC (I)

Answer	Example	Per cent of respondents (n=375)
Good	Good; good opportunity; I appreciate it	21%
Very good	Really good; really useful; much appreciated	25%
Excellent	Splendid; brilliant; extremely important	30%
Positive that the individual does not have to cover the costs	Obviously, it's a nice feature to have given that I don't have to think about funding fees.	5%

AUTHORS' REACTIONS TO OA PUBLISHING THROUGH SC (II)

Answer	Example	Per cent of respondents (n=375)
Enhances visibility	Allows authors' work to be seen by all, so more visibility for authors, departments and university	8%
Depends on the cost of the agreement	Good but it also depends on the costs, if it impacts on other things	6%
Companies make profit off research	Something is obviously wrong when we need to pay fees to private companies for making publicly funded work available to the public	5%

WOULD AUTHORS HAVE PAID FOR OA IF NOT COVERED?

Yes	Perhaps	No
15 %	24%	61%

If so, how would you have funded costs involved?

- 15% covered by grant
- 9% covered by the institution
- 7% covered by research group/lab
- 1% covered privately

SUPPORT AUTHORS WANT FROM THEIR UNIVERSITIES (I)

Answer	Example	Per cent of respondents (n=375)
Ensure there is funding and handle payments for APCs	Universities should always include in their budget the right economical support to make sure to cover all the fees [to] guarantee open access publication.	44%
Provide more/better information	Information about which journals are included. We bumped into this by ‘accident’. We need to be aware of the pros/cons.	34%
Don’t know		13%
Other	The support is sufficient; It’s a matter of prioritizing	10%

SUPPORT AUTHORS WANT FROM THEIR UNIVERSITIES (II)

Answer	Example	Per cent of respondents (n=375)
Lists or search engines for OA journals	Providing a database with the rights, and agreement between University and publishers	4%
Remove profit in scholarly publishing/ support non-profit alternatives	Ultimately, I think that the whole publishing system needs an overhaul; More information about subject repositories; Run their own journals..	3%

HOW CAN LIBRARY SERVICES ON OA BE IMPROVED? (I)

Answer	Example
Generally pleased	The library services hitherto are outstanding, and [I] hope to see permanent agreements for open access publishing..
Non-OA solutions	It would be better to use that money for journal subscription.
Cost of SC	I'm curious what the cost is to the university for this arrangement
Improved information	<p>I was not aware that the agreement existed, nor did my supervisors, so perhaps this can be made clearer.</p> <p>Tell researchers about the agreement. It may affect their choice of journals and increase the rate of OA publishing</p>

HOW CAN LIBRARY SERVICES ON OA BE IMPROVED? (II)

Answer	Example
Better search tools	To be able to search for journals within the agreement based on field and impact factor.
Help to avoid predatory journals	
Registering publications	Help in feeding in information on new articles in different channels would be helpful
Research communication	Possibilities for the researcher to comment their own article for non-scientists (public).

CONCLUSION

If OA publishing is **made easy** for authors, it is generally highly appreciated.

- most authors want OA if it is easy and predictable
- some are cost aware and would prefer non-profit alternatives
- very few say they prefer the subscription system

Researchers/authors want **information**, at the right time, about:

- offset and other agreements
- alternatives to APC solutions
- the OA market and developments
- predatory journals
- search tools

IMPLICATIONS FOR FUTURE INITIATIVES AND FOR LIBRARY SERVICES?

Changing norms and practices is difficult

Researchers have a lot invested in their publications

- In the short perspective, if OA publishing is simple and predictable and not too different from before, most will get onboard
- In the (slightly) longer perspective, building cost awareness and awareness of alternatives among researchers

Many researchers want to learn about simple ways for their publications to become OA

- Support researchers to discover and support a diversity of (trusted) publishing alternatives

PUBLICATIONS FROM THE EVALUATION GROUP

Evaluation of offset agreements – report 4: Springer Compact (forthcoming)

Evaluation of offset agreements – report 3: Springer Compact (2018)

Utvärdering av offsetavtal – delrapport 2: Springer Compact och Institute of Physics (2017)

Utvärdering av Springer Compact – halvårsrapport 1 (2017)