



Report on the ALCTS Continuing Resources Section College and Research Libraries Interest Group Meeting. American Library Association Annual Conference, Las Vegas, June 2014

Authors: Buddy Pennington & Doralyn Rossmann

This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published in [Technical Services Quarterly](#) on June 15, 2015, available online: <http://www.tandfonline.com/10.1080/07317131.2015.1031609>.

Pennington, Buddy & Doralyn Rossmann, "Report on the ALCTS Continuing Resources Section College and Research Libraries Interest Group Meeting. American Library Association Annual Conference, Las Vegas, June 2014" *Technical Services Quarterly* 32, no. 3 (June 15, 2015): 325–327. doi:[10.1080/07317131.2015.1031609](https://doi.org/10.1080/07317131.2015.1031609).

Made available through Montana State University's [ScholarWorks](http://scholarworks.montana.edu)
scholarworks.montana.edu

Report on the ALCTS Continuing Resources Section College and Research Libraries Interest Group Meeting. American Library Association Annual Conference, Las Vegas, June 2014

Buddy Pennington & Doralyn Rossmann

The ALCTS Continuing Resources Section College and Research Libraries Interest Group met on Sunday, June 29, to discuss aspects of the topic Continuing Resources and the Role of Libraries with Publishing in Open Access and Hybrid Journals.

The discussion began by examining different models of supporting author fees that authors typically pay to make their research open access. One model is the membership model, where an institution pays a membership fee and researchers from that organization then receive support to make their research open access. One example of this membership model is BioMed Central (<http://www.biomedcentral.com/>). BioMed Central, which publishes over 250 open access journals, provides a variety of memberships including a prepay membership; a shared support membership, in which the cost of publishing is shared between the institution and the author; and a supporter membership, in which the institution pays a flat fee and affiliated authors then receive a discount on any author fees when publishing in one of the BioMed Central journals. BioMed Central also provides the foundation membership free of charge to institutions from developing nations that meet specific criteria.

A number of libraries have set up programs to fund author fees associated with open access publishing. Two examples include the Johns Hopkins Libraries Open Access Promotion Fund (<http://guides.library.jhu.edu/oapf>) and the University of California—Irvine Libraries Open Access Publishing Fund (<http://www.lib.uci.edu/about/projects/scamp/uci-libraries-open-access-publishing-fund.html>). Details of specific programs will vary. Considerations include who is eligible for funding, the amount of funding, etc. Should libraries provide funding to all faculty or target those disciplines that lack grant resources to support publication? Do libraries fund author fees in hybrid journals at the same rate as open access journals, at a lower rate, or not at all?

Faculty may be familiar with many journals in their discipline, but newer titles launching under the auspices of open access are not as well known. A number of publishers and standalone journals have arisen that seek to collect fees from authors without providing typical editorial or publishing services or without providing publications that meet the benchmark of other quality academic journals in the discipline. Known as predatory publishers or journals, these venues seek to exploit a business model where the academic author pays a fee to make the article available to everyone. Whether providing financial support or not, librarians can help faculty in identifying quality open access publications and avoiding predatory ones. A resource for this is the site Scholarly Open Access (<http://scholarlyoa.com/>), maintained by Jeffrey Beall, a librarian at the Auraria Library, University of Colorado—Denver. The site maintains a listing of potentially predatory publishers and standalone journals as well as a published set of criteria used in making such a determination. This site can provide guidance, but ultimately librarians and authors need to make the final determination on the quality of an open access publication themselves.

Libraries still face challenges in engaging with faculty regarding open access publishing. A 2012 Ithaca S+R survey describes a significant gap between faculty and library directors in rating how important academic libraries are in providing “active support that helps to increase the productivity of my research and scholarship.”¹ How do libraries close this gap in demonstrating to faculty that they remain essential partners in the academy but in new and innovative ways as scholarly publishing changes?

One strategy is for libraries to work with faculty in establishing an open access policy for their campus. Kevin Smith describes such an approach at Duke University.² Other strategies include hiring a scholarly communications librarian and working more closely with the institution's research office. A good long-term strategy is to engage graduate students as they will be tomorrow's faculty. Some libraries now make theses and dissertations available to all, while some allow students to embargo their publication. A recent statement from the American History Association encouraging libraries and university to embargo history PhD dissertations for 6 years serves as a reminder that open access publishing is complicated by many diverse viewpoints and perspectives.

Another strategy is to educate faculty on author rights and support the negotiation efforts for faculty authors to retain their rights when publishing. Many libraries provide information on retaining author rights to inform faculty, and some also provide talking points or model language for faculty to utilize when negotiating with a publisher. For example, the SPARC Author Addendum (<http://www.sparc.arl.org/resources/authors/addendum>) provides helpful information and suggested language to use. While these helpful tools exist, it is important to remember that this is a negotiation. Publishers may not accept all, or any, of these terms.

In addition to helping faculty navigate the open access environment, libraries are becoming publishers themselves. A number of libraries have utilized Open Journal Systems (<https://pkp.sfu.ca/ojs/>) to provide a platform for open access journals. SCOAP (<http://scoap3.org/>), a consortium of libraries, funding agencies,

and research centers have partnered to fund open access publishing in particle physics. Knowledge Unlatched is a new program where libraries can pool funding to support open access book publishing. As more libraries join the group, the costs for individual libraries are reduced.

As libraries move to publishing, they must not forget their primary mission to preserve and provide access. Libraries have long preserved journal materials and many support online journal preservation initiatives such as LOCKSS and Portico. Now libraries need to preserve journal materials they themselves help to publish. A common strategy is to put these materials into an institutional repository, which is engineered to both preserve and provide access to these digital materials. But is this enough? What guarantee do we have that library repositories will be around for decades or centuries to come? Should institutions develop state, regional, or disciplinary programs to strengthen the safety net for these materials? In essence, who is backing up the library?

Open access publishing is providing numerous opportunities for libraries to engage with their faculty and assert their value to the academic enterprise in new and innovative ways. Libraries are employing different strategies to support open access publishing, from funding author fees to publishing and preserving open access journals. This interest group discussion revealed that even as libraries transform themselves into active agents in open access publishing, many questions remain.

Notes

¹ Ithaka S+R. (2013). US Faculty Survey 2012. Retrieved from http://www.sr.ithaka.org/sites/default/files/reports/ithaka_SR_US_Faculty_Survey_2012_FINAL.pdf

² Smith, K. L. (2012). Why open access? the policy environment and process on one university campus. *Insights*, 25(3), 246–250. doi:[10.1629/2048-7754.25.3.246](https://doi.org/10.1629/2048-7754.25.3.246)