

Open Access, Internet-First Scholarly Publishing



Process

- Seven experienced editors have agreed to speak for seven minutes each.
- The second half of this forum has been reserved for you to make brief statements and to direct questions to the panelists.
- Adjournment will be at 3:30.
- We are making an audio recording of the entire forum and will post a transcript on the University Faculty website for the benefit of our colleagues who wished they could have attended this afternoon. To

assist with the transcription process, please identify yourself before speaking.

Allow me to set an example by introducing myself:

J. Robert Cooke, presenter

Ken King and Ross Atkinson, collaborators

Part 1: Cornell implementation of the digital archive, DSpace

Part 2: Creation of a national, university-based federation for

online publishing of scholarly materials with royalty-free, open access to the primary scholarship



1. Crisis in Scholarly Publishing:

a. Exponential growth in knowledge (three additional miles of shelf space each year at Cornell)

Pogo said "We have met the enemy, and he is us."



b. Spiraling subscription prices (decades of price growth much faster than inflation)

Monopolies behave in entirely predictable ways.



c. Caught in a paradigm shift (must maintain both print and digital)

Most library materials are used infrequently, but the content remains vital, nonetheless.

Perhaps we can store content compactly (separate from the paper) and print a copy only when really needed.



We also have important needs, such as audio recordings, images (scanning electron microscope and MRI, as well as traditional photography), motion pictures and databases, that go beyond paper. With the addition of a general-purpose digital archive, we now have an opportunity to more fully address these needs.



c. Responses – short-term and long-term



2. Loss of Control

a. Give away; buy back (Outsourcing Gone-amuck)

(one-of-a-kind materials allow a monopoly to develop)

b. We have a one-time opportunity to regain control
(publishers are learning how to maintain their control in the new paradigm; universities are facing severe financial pressures)

Strategic Intent: Rather than engage in a continued 'food fight' over subscription costs, let's claim control of the content before the publishers gain control.



3. Regain Control

a. Universities should assume responsibility for publishing and archiving their own scholarship.

b. We should develop a federation of university archives, supported by their faculties and professional societies, to achieve open access.

With foundation support, we will install the MIT-created digital archive, DSpace. □

Cornell, MIT, Columbia, Toronto, Rochester, Ohio State and Univ. of Washington and Oxford University are conducting self-archiving experiments. [Other experiments are also underway.]

4. Advantages of Open Access, Internet-first publishing

- a. Enables worldwide access (and local too)
- b. Improves research and teaching productivity
- c. Financially sustainable: Reduces costs
 - i. Share resources nationally thereby avoiding redundant purchase by many universities and redundant local storage costs □ (All universities now wish to acquire everything they can afford.)
 - ii. Allow viewing and the making of a personal copy **WITHOUT ROYALTY** (can't stop anyway and avoids tracking royalty for reserve usage)

iii. Provide fee-based, professional quality printing (an extension of course pack idea) and pay a royalty only if commoditized (but original remains freely available) □

(Faculty are paid largely indirectly anyway – not through royalties)

iv. Broaden the scope of materials that can be handled in a routine manner to include multimedia – movies, images, audio, data sets, etc.



5. Important challenges we must overcome

A. Must make digital publishing compatible with current faculty reward structure for tenure and promotion.

- Personal transition to digital must be voluntary, (but an institutional change is essential)

- Tenured faculty should lead

- Tenure should be based upon the quality of the scholarship – not upon the medium

for distribution– whether Internet and paper-based

- Peer review has meaning independent of the distribution vehicle
- Branding is needed to aid readers and to provide peer recognition for authors.



B. Must provide new mechanisms for quality control.

- Review process could be the same, but interesting opportunities exist.
- Post then review – digital storage is less expensive than print storage so we can relax conditions for posting – delay vetting, which can be enhanced online.

Two examples:

- **Role of Societies:** Commission the professional societies to provide the vetting (and not necessarily the editing and publishing). The societies would be asked to identify the articles in the federated database of content and quality suited for their members. [In this age of

interdisciplinary scholarship, any article could appear in multiple Contents without incurring the cost for redundancy.]

- **Peer review of indefinite duration:**

When each article is posted, automatically extract its list of references and add a link from each of the earlier articles to the new one. □ A reader entering the literature at any point would be led immediately to all subsequent, related work. □ This would improve the scholars efficiency in locating related work and would provide critiques into the future (not just during peer review for the few months after submission).

□

- C. **Must allow professional/scholarly societies to remain financially viable.**

(Many are now dependent upon publishing revenues.)

□

- D. **Must assure long-term archival preservation**

University Faculty Forum on
**Open Access Scholarly
Publishing:
Opportunities and Obstacles**

Co-sponsored by the Cornell
University Library



Paul Ginsparg, founder of arXiv
Eberhard Bodenschatz, Editor
Physica D and New Journal of Physics.

John Rowehl, Managing Editor,
Philosophical Review

Jeffrey Rusten, Vice Pres. for
Publications,

American Philological Association

R. Keith Dennis, Executive
Editor '95-'98

Mathematical Reviews

Joe Halpern, Editor-in-Chief,

Journal of the ACM
Karl Niklas, Editor in Chief,
American Journal of Botany