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Introduction

Martin Hall, Vice-Chancellor, University of Salford and Conference Chair

The book is exploding. Dog-eared pages between comfortable covers, marked up in pencil, are disappearing. In their place are e-books, instantly delivered and not for recycling. And as the ubiquity and speed of mobile broadband expands, so will the quantity and sophistication of hyperlinks to other sources, data sets, images and live news feeds that will make the future book more of a portal than a fixed and settled text. Many will regret and resist this, often for good reasons. But these new technologies are here to stay, and have particular implications for research and publication in the Humanities and Social Sciences – the subject of the discussions at this conference, summarized here. And those who took part endorsed the importance of these issues. As one participant put it: “one of the best conferences I’ve been to in years – there wasn’t a single duff session”.

One group that is looking into the future of these new technologies is the Hybrid Publishing Lab. “BookSprint” is an experiment that gets authors to work together in writing and mutual review to get new work published in less than a week. In turn, this turns the concept of a university press inside out. The next challenge is to get information about new work known and disseminated, again using new digital platforms and a fully open publishing infrastructure.

The point of these and other innovations showcased during the conference is to ensure that these new technologies and publishing models work to the best future interests of scholarly work in the Humanities and Social Sciences. For there is little doubt that, for a wide range of disciplines, a continuing dependence on traditional paper publishing would be catastrophic. This crisis was outlined and discussed during several of the conference’s panel discussions. Humanities and Social Science scholars are squeezed between the requirement that their work achieves demonstrable impact through wide and appropriate dissemination, and the prohibitive subsidies required for conventional monograph publication. This is difficult enough for those working in comparatively wealthy countries; for those in developing economies, it’s a disaster.

A paradox of this coming digital revolution in scholarly work is that, while exploding the concept of the book, e-publishing also reaffirms some of the primary values of humanities and social science research. In his opening keynote, Jean-Claude Guédon cast thinking, researching and writing as a joint, collaborative set of activities, shared in coffee shops, editing, refinement and correction of drafts and concepts. Scientists work

“Fantastic and very interesting conference, with a nice mixture of academic, polemic and business practice”

Researcher
this way as well, of course, shaping tacit knowledge and interpretation in the lab before committing to codification, presentation and publication. Jean-Claude sees the constraints of conventional paper publishing as limiting this creativity and openness. And in her keynote talk, Kathleen Fitzpatrick added a different angle to this, arguing that traditional peer review requirements also close down engagement and creativity, pushing work into an inappropriate conformity with a set of publishing processes. Kathleen showed how open peer review can result in far more appropriate results, enhancing the depth of understanding of a subject area and the quality of writing.

None of this will happen without appropriate and effective business models; when anything can be – and is – disseminated on the Web, publishing is meaningless without the facility for discriminating between content that is to be trusted, and junk. Funding agencies are increasingly realizing this. The conference heard that the European Union has earmarked € 200m a year for humanities and social sciences research and that open access publishing will be a requirement for monographs as well as for journal articles. This will make it all the more important to resolve current debates about the relative merits of “green” and “gold” publishing and the role of open access repositories. Some publishers also realize the long-term significance of the transitions that are currently underway, and are looking hard and productively at their ways of working. Our conference heard about several of these new directions in detail, adding an appropriate hard edge to coming digital utopias.

Participants had clear views about the path to the future for humanities and social science publishing in this era of the exploding book. Some of the biggest barriers to open access monograph publishing? Costs, perceptions of quality, the confusion between green and gold, a general lack of understanding of the model and its benefits. Some of the significant opportunities?

“**This was a most amazing conference; I am honoured to have been included. Thank you for inviting me to speak!**”

*Speaker*
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Executive summary

As academics in most disciplines know, the unit cost of traditionally printed monographs is rising, while sales have been in steady decline.

This is a particular problem in the humanities and social sciences, in which monographs are often the output of choice for scholars and the benchmark against which standing and academic performance are judged. Open Access (OA) is a model that has the potential to support a vibrant research environment, enabling non-restricted access, widening readerships, facilitating collaboration and the creation of new ideas and increasing impact. Yet the problems inherent in moving to OA publishing for books seem so numerous, and so hard to solve, that even the Finch Report concluded that it couldn’t be insisted upon without further experimentation.

Two organisations, leading experimentation, Jisc Collections and OAPEN, thought it was high time to bring together experts from across academia and publishing to explore open access as a means not just to secure the monograph’s future, but also to transform it, extending its reach and ’making the scholarship better’.

The conference

Over two days at the British Library, researchers, university librarians and information managers, funders and publishers heard speakers repeatedly consign to history the ideas that producing a book is a solitary task, and that a book is a finished piece of work. Instead, especially in the humanities and social sciences where ‘the conversation is key’, it is a collaborative process. What’s more, embracing the digital gives scholars an unprecedented opportunity to collaborate more widely – with people working in different subject areas, with those working in other countries, and with those for whom the price of books has previously been a serious barrier to scholarship.

While that idea has plenty of appeal, it also raises a wealth of concerns and practical problems for all stakeholders.

Researchers worry about how they’ll be able to ensure due credit for work that may be less formal in nature, and how they’ll be able to protect their work when it is being re-used in unforeseen ways. They are concerned that books they publish in OA may not be regarded seriously by their peers and by career panels, and on the other side of the same coin, they fear that they may not be able to assess the quality of OA material they discover during the course of their own research.

Information professionals have watched early experiments with OA monograph publishing, and have found some to have promise. As with most early experiments, things are improving, and there is much work being done to ensure that OA books are easy to find, read, and can be readily discovered in library services and online retailers. Worries remain over reliability – if books are freely available from publishers, librarians will find it hard to hold publishers to account if functions don’t work properly, or platforms are changed or withdrawn altogether. Reassurances are being looked for when it comes to long-term sustainability and preservation.
Funding bodies described their own current positions with regard to OA, and it’s clear that they are at very different stages in the process of its adoption.

Publishers explained their need to develop new ways of working and new business models. Several traditional publishers are trialing new approaches, and new ones have been set up, notably by academics who want to innovate and help to shape the way that OA develops. Most are working with their own particular version of Freemium, and exploring ways to generate income via optional paid-for printed versions and added value features. Few are claiming to make profit, and working out who pays the production costs is a major imperative, but there are other models too. Publishers are also discussing how licensing will work, what the workflows will be like, what infrastructure will be needed and how readers will find OA books. The heart of the matter though is finding economically viable business models.

Drilling down into the detail

Breakout sessions targeted at specific stakeholder groups focused on areas of particular interest were held on the second day.

Researchers and PhD students found out that there are new services that can help them to find reputable OA publishers, and emerging digital technologies that can enable them to gain credit for their collaborations and demonstrate the impact of their work. They heard, too, that open licences, built upon copyright, offer opportunities to support new research whilst also offering real protection against misuse of their work.

“An inspiring conference and I am now a convert to OA!! Fantastic thanks”

Funder

The session for publishers and librarians included details of initiatives that will help scholars to be assured of the quality, currency and version of the work they find online, and of methods that are being used to ensure OA content is readily discoverable.

Funders and policy makers were updated on efforts that are being made in the UK and across Europe to support dissemination of OA books and, while each of the speakers described very individual interpretations of their role in that process, they also reported very similar issues around quality, sustainability and infrastructure. With this in mind, there was broad agreement that pan-European collaboration might be effective.

Across all three sessions the importance of high quality, detailed metadata was stressed again and again.
What did we learn?

Distilled right down, the key messages that came out of the conference were these:

» Open access for monographs is not only possible but necessary if we want to be able to innovate, to communicate and disseminate humanities and social science research widely, and to build a sustainable future for the monograph

» Effective quality assurance is key to the successful adoption of OA publishing

» Collaboration throughout the supply chain and across national boundaries will be required

» We must be flexible and willing to accommodate innovative models, not only to sustain the monograph, but for peer review, impact and reputation

What next?

There is huge interest in OA publishing for monographs in the humanities and social sciences, as we saw from the large number of experiments that are being tried, and from the large numbers of people who attended the conference and contributed to the Twitter discussion (#oabooks). So the time to take OA monograph publishing forward, and for all stakeholders to consider in detail how they can contribute to the transition to Open Access, is now.
Day 1 roundup: 1 July 2013

Welcome and opening: Setting the scene

Martin Hall, Vice-Chancellor, University of Salford

In his scene-setting welcome, Martin Hall, Vice-Chancellor of the University of Salford, talked about the crisis that has raged for two decades or more in the world of monograph publishing while the cost of books has increased and sales have declined. Amid all the work that has been done in the last few years to promote open access (OA) publishing for other scholarly works, the particular problems associated with monographs have largely been parked – even last year’s Finch Report said that it would be too difficult to insist on OA publishing for monographs until more experimentation has been tried.

Martin said that, against that backdrop, the conference was a timely attempt to focus on the particular importance of monographs in the humanities and social sciences, to explore ways to safeguard their future, and to consider the opportunities that digital publishing opens up to share knowledge more widely, and ‘make the scholarship better’.

Keynote: The tree sociologies of the book and the e-book, and the open access

Jean-Claude Guédon, Professor at the Department of Comparative Literature, University of Montreal

In his keynote, Jean-Claude Guédon sought to do away with the notion that producing a book is a solitary task. For him, it is a joint effort, from the discussion of ideas in coffee shops and online, to the editing process and beyond publication to comment, correction and further development of ideas. He believes that the idea of authorship belongs specifically to the world of traditionally printed books, and that – in a digital world – it can be done away with, as richer collaborations produce more original ideas and better work. That’s not to say credit won’t be given where it is due – new forms of recognition and reward will replace outdated ones.
And in the panel discussion that followed, representatives from research funding bodies came together with open access pioneers to share their perspectives on the issues that face the humanities and social sciences in the wake of the Finch Report.

Panel discussion: HSS after Finch

Chair: Martin Hall, Vice-Chancellor, University of Salford

Participants:

» Rupert Gatti, Director, Open Book Publishers and fellow of Trinity College, University of Cambridge
» Philippe Aigrain, CEO of Sopinspace, author of Sharing
» Carl-Christian Buhr, Member of the Cabinet of Neelie Kroes, vice president of the European Commission, Digital Agenda
» Sally Hardy, Chief Executive, Regional Studies Association
» Kimberley Hackett, REF Higher Education Policy Advisor, Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE)

“Dissemination is a very small part of the research process, but it’s critical. There’s no point knowing it if you can’t tell people”

Rupert Gatti

Rupert Gatti kicked off the panel discussion with some cold practicalities. As researchers in the humanities and social sciences find it harder to secure funding, it is increasingly important that they can demonstrate the reach and impact of the work they have done already.

And, while the high price of printed monographs limits sales in the comparatively wealthy developed nations, it effectively leaves researchers working in countries with emerging economies back in the bleachers. For Rupert, the traditional pay-for-access model does real social harm.

But it’s not just the cost of printed monographs that mitigates against wide reach, as Philippe explained. Today, there are more writers working on more interesting new material than ever before, but few people have more time available for reading than they used to. So, even if material is openly available, how can those who publish it get it noticed? His organisation Sopinspace is experimenting with ways to make books available in multiple versions – print, e-books, PDFs, and augmented edition websites – and also testing interactive models that invite contributions.

“OA publishers don’t know how to promote free to view books”

Philippe Aigran
Carl-Christian Buhr told the conference that the European Union (EU) has earmarked €200m each year for the humanities and social sciences in its upcoming Horizon 2020 funding round, and that open access publishing will be a requirement for monographs as well as for journal articles. In the short term the EU is comfortable with green OA despite the embargoes that this implies, simply because it will make it easier for those with work already in progress to migrate to OA. But the EU supports Gold OA as well, by allowing APC’s to be paid out of Horizon 2020 grants.

With that in mind, Carl-Christian said that the EU is now conducting its own pilot focused on publishing not just research outputs but also the data behind them, and will explore in detail the infrastructure necessary to facilitate long-term access, curation and use.

For the Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE) Kimberley Hackett confirmed that there will not be an open access requirement for monographs in the post-2014 Research Excellence Framework (REF), because few of the Research Councils involved in the discussion are confident that a workable model has yet been proven. Nonetheless, the councils are convinced that OA offers genuine benefits, and a formal consultation will be carried out by HEFCE in the coming months.

Some publishers have decided to test the waters, though probably none can be said to have plunged in headlong, for sound business reasons. The conference’s afternoon sessions explored some of the business models that are being tried.

Session: Promising business models

Chair: Brian Hole, Director, Ubiquity Press

Participants:
» Martin Eve and Caroline Edwards, Founders of Open Library of Humanities
» Frances Pinter, Executive Director, Knowledge Unlatched
» Carrie Calder, Marketing Director, Palgrave Macmillan

Some publishers are developing models that rely on libraries to form consortia to contribute towards OA publishing costs. Martin Eve and Caroline Edwards of the Open Library of Humanities described their library partnership subsidy model and the current pilot to explore costings, labour needs, infrastructure requirements and potential revenue streams. Frances Pinter of Knowledge Unlatched explained her vision for a global consortium enabling publishers and libraries to

"The EU is committed to open access. We like green, and we are not averse to gold”
Carl-Christian Buhr

"You have no idea how expensive it is to keep things closed”
Frances Pinter
share the cost of production drawing on existing funding streams. Knowledge Unlatched has 30 titles for the first trial of the model.

Other publishers, including Palgrave Macmillan (PM), are looking to publishing fees as a way to fund publication. Marketing director Carrie Calder told the conference that PM has fixed on £11,000 as the upfront charge for a full book (less for shorter works). She said that PM will produce just one book in this way in 2013, and potentially a dozen in 2014: if this rate of take-up seems slow, Carrie said it is because finding the publication fee is, as yet, a challenge – in future, authors may be able to raise it in novel ways such as crowd-sourcing, or recover it from their universities or funders. The Wellcome Trust is one funder that has recently included monograph publishing in its open access mandate.

Licensing is a key issue for researchers as they get to grips with new ways to ensure that their work is accurately cited, and they receive due recognition for the efforts. The next two sessions explored the possibilities offered by open licensing.

Session: Copyright and Creative Commons

Ben White, Head of Intellectual Property, British Library and Joscelyn Upendran, CEO, Zilpa

“It’s possible to plagiarise anything – but everyone wants their work to be discovered”

Ben White

that is at least as good as traditional licensing methods. He pointed out that they also have the advantage of facilitating the use of new kinds of metrics to measure reach and impact in an open environment.

Joscelyn Upendran of Zilpa, an experienced lawyer formerly connected to Creative Commons (CC), gave the delegates a detailed overview of the benefits and flexibility of the different Creative Commons (CC) licences, and the choices that exist for authors who want to retain a say in how their work is used. Her advice? Take courage from the fact that the UK government uses its own form of open licences for Her Majesty’s Revenue and Customs (HMRC), and fill out the CC licences as fully and carefully as you can to make sure you get the cover that you want.

The British Library’s Ben White discussed the rights that copyright law extends to authors, and the limitations of the legislation. He also raised the unwelcome truth that some authors may have unwittingly signed away their intellectual property rights to their employers or publishers, and suggested that open licences such as those offered by Creative Commons offer protection

Day 1 roundup: 1 July 2013
Session: Peer review and quality

Kathleen Fitzpatrick, Director of Scholarly Communication, Modern Language Association (MLA)

Kathleen Fitzpatrick kept delegates’ energy levels high towards the end of the first day with her discussion of the shortcomings of the traditional peer review models, and her experience of the ways in which OA practices can actively help.

She pointed out examples of some who have exposed their work to open peer review and said that the result is quite different. In her own experience, OA makes it possible for reviewers to offer comment paragraph by paragraph rather than holistically about the work as a whole. Each review model has its advantages so, as she said, wouldn’t it be great if we could devise a way to give the researcher the best of both?

“The current definition of peer review is starting to be questioned: it’s too narrow”

Kathleen Fitzpatrick

Launch: Directory of Open Access books

Bas Savenije, Director of the Netherlands National Library (KB) and Eelco Ferwerda, Director of OAPEN Foundation

The first day closed on a high note, with the launch of the Directory of Open Access Books (DOAB), a major initiative designed to provide an authoritative list of open access monograph publishers, and to give publishers and authors an opportunity to promote their involvement with open access, and to increase the visibility and usage of their titles.

All presentations are available on the OAbooks SlideShare channel and you can watch all the presentations on the OAbooks YouTube channel.
Day 2 Roundup: 2 July 2013

On day 2, speakers drilled down into the detail to explore how OA publishing might be made to work sustainably, starting with a series of short showcases from organisations that have made a start.

Showcase 1: Open Book Publishers

Rupert Gatti, Director, Open Book Publishers

A fellow of Trinity College at the University of Cambridge, Rupert Gatti told the conference how frustrated he had become with the limitations of traditional publishing models and that this led him to become part of the team that set up Open Book Publishers four years ago. Since then, Open Book has published 31 fully peer reviewed books under Creative Commons (CC) licences, making the text freely available via its own website and through other outlets such as Google Books. They are also available for purchase both in print and as e-books.

“We’re seeing more reader interactions, before and after publication” Rupert Gatti

Rupert’s statistics showed that each title is averaging 500 reads per month by readers all over the world. Key features of Open Books’ OA books make it easy for readers to connect back to original sources and to re-use the work, and comments and discussions can take place ‘on the page’. This, he said, is only the start, and there are plans in development to add multimedia content, possibly via QR codes on the page.

Clearly, these early forays into OA publishing have addressed some of the limitations of the traditional book and extended the reach and impact of the OA books that have been published so far, but Rupert said that obtaining funding and ensuring that the model is sustainable are key priorities. The production cost is £3,700 per title, which is not being charged to authors. Instead, Open Book Publishers is looking to a variety of other potential sources, including university grants, contributions from research funding bodies, library sales, and crowd-sourcing.

In the meantime, Open Book is working to foster a genuine spirit of openness – researchers need encouragement to digitise their primary sources and make them freely available. And Rupert asked the librarians in the room: how can OA books be integrated into library systems, and made discoverable?
Showcase 1: OpenEdition

Pierre Mounier, Associate Director, Centre for Open Electronic Publishing,

The Centre for Open Electronic Publishing has developed its own version of Freemium that gives free access to content in HTML while offering a range of paid-for premium services to libraries and professional and academic readers to generate a commercial income for the publisher. Its role is to support publishers to move towards OA publishing models, and it has French government funding for this. Pierre explained that, as long as a publisher has developed a reasonable model, the Centre will work with them to help them make it work.

As part of that commitment it has developed the OpenEdition.org platform – an international, multilingual catalogue for publishers. The aim is to have 1,000 books available by the end of 2013. The Centre has the resources and ability to take books in any form and encode them on their publisher’s behalf, and to generate multiple formats to ensure readability across different devices. Tools to support dissemination of the work include links to online book stores to buy print versions, help with appropriate citation, downloadable bibliographical data, and the ability for readers to embed the book into another website to facilitate further sharing.

Showcase 1: OECD publishing

Toby Green, Head of Publishing

Institutional publisher the OECD now publishes around 400 OA titles per year, aided by government subsidies that are soon to be stopped. So, Toby explained, the pressure is now on for the organisation to balance the appeal of making everything freely available against the need to cover production costs and ensure long-term sustainability.

He kicked off with a review of statistics showing the huge growth in numbers of young people going into tertiary education in OECD countries, and the fact that these people often want access to research in their future lives, even when they are no longer working in academia. He described how policy makers and funders are responding to this wider requirement for access to research, and said that it makes sound business sense for publishers to find the largest possible audience for the content that they hold.

The OECD’s solution is to offer a free read-only version of each of its books on its own website and via Google Books: printed versions are produced on demand and sold via the OECD online shop, traditional book sellers and re-sellers, as well as niche outlets for highly specialised works – for example, LexisNexis for legal books. Added-value services are available at a price for higher intensity users of material, such as libraries. OECD figures show
that, while ten out of every 12 reads of its OA books were free in 2012, uptake of premium value services has grown.

Nonetheless, traditional routes to market are still needed in markets where the OECD brand is less familiar and is not routinely searched for. Here, the most satisfactory method remains the traditional one of using agents to knock on doors, make appointments, and provide demonstrations.

The morning’s showcases wrapped up with a conclusion that the situation for OA publishing is evolving rapidly, and that, as yet, there’s no certainty about where it’s heading next. For now, the three organisations in the showcase session are focusing on getting OA books out into the world and testing the models. None expect to make a profit from OA in these early days, and they recognise the need to work together to ensure that, if commercial organisations want to make a profit from OA publishing, they don’t do it by ring-fencing content.

For much of the rest of day 2 delegates split into specialist groups to explore further how OA publishing will affect their working practices and what benefits it might offer.
Strand 1: How exactly do you get your monograph published in open access?

For researchers and PhD students

An introduction to the process, and an overview of sources of information.

It’s an interesting question, and this strand was developed to help HSS researchers and PhD students to find some answers. Professor Tom Cochrane, Deputy Vice-Chancellor at Queensland University of Technology, chaired the discussion, while speakers went on to describe the process, introduce key sources of information and flag up some important issues.

Connecting research and researchers

An Introduction to ORCID with Ed Pentz, Executive Director, CrossRef

Ed Pentz’s talk on ORCID (Open Researchers and Contributor ID) offered an accessible introduction to a complex subject.

He explained that ORCID is an international, interdisciplinary, open, not-for-profit, community-driven organisation with a mission to provide a persistent digital identifier for researchers and scholars to distinguish each individual from every other, and to automate linkages to research works by embedding the identifiers in research workflows so that work is recognised appropriately.

That’s become more of a difficulty as perceptions have altered about what constitutes the scholarly record – while it used to consist primarily of journal papers and monographs, now data, software, blogs and tweets are all recognised as valid ways for researchers and academics to contribute to scholarly communications and get credit. Ed quoted Herbert van de Sompel, of Los Alamos National Library, to underline the point – in his talk ‘Towards a machine-actionable scholarly communication system’, van de Sompel argued memorably that scholarly communications are moving from a journal-centric view to a contributor-centric one: this is where ORCID comes in.

The ORCID Registry enables a unique and persistent identifier to be used by an individual throughout their career, across professional activities and affiliations. The ORCID identifier is embedded in work’s metadata, independent of platform or type of work and this leads to improved system interoperability – across disciplines, organisations, and countries. With wider adoption will come a reduction in the reporting workload for researchers and greater simplicity when it comes to depositing work in a repository.
Ed said that it is free to claim an ORCID and the only required fields are full name and address, but adding more data makes it easier to positively identify an individual so it’s advisable to provide more. Record holders can manage who sees their data by adjusting privacy settings, and by selecting trusted organisations with whom to share limited access data and/or update the record with information on research activities linked through workflows. While organisations may register and create records for their employees, unless they specify authority to present data publicly, the record will remain private until claimed by the individual researcher. And, at all times, the researcher has the ability to change privacy, proxy, and trusted party settings.

Ed closed with an overview of how ORCID has been taken up so far – it is being integrated into many systems by universities, publishers, funders and others, it has over 80 member organisations and more than 250,000 ORCID identifiers had been claimed as of early July 2013.

Get to grips with copyright and creative commons

A guide to Creative Commons for HSS researchers with Ernesto Priego, Lecturer in Library Science, City University London

Ernesto Priego gave a ‘guided tour’ around the Guide to Creative Commons for Humanities and Social Science Monograph Authors that has been developed by the OAPEN-UK team (Ellen Collins, Caren Milloy and Graham Stone) and was distributed to all delegates in their conference packs. It was edited jointly by Ernesto, James Baker and Martin Paul Eve, and during Ernesto’s talk it was shown on the screen in the form in which it is openly available on the OAPEN-UK project website.

The guide explores concerns that have been expressed publicly by researchers, learned societies and publishers in response to inquiries in the House of Commons and the House of Lords, and Ernesto showed how its authors first identified a number of common worries and then went on to address them, having collaborated with editors, publishers, lawyers and other experts including Creative Commons to draft the answers.

To provide some context, he touched on the reasons why researchers often feel protective of their monographs and of the years of hard work that has gone into them, and looked at how these attitudes can vary from discipline to discipline. These concerns are also explored in the guide, which covers the various licensing options available within Creative Commons. And because these open licences imply significant changes in the way that work is made available to the public, Ernesto discussed some of the anxieties around openness and use of Creative Commons licences in the context of current Intellectual Property (IP) law. What’s clear in the guide is that there are widespread misunderstandings about what is permitted by Creative Commons licences: in fact, plagiarism and misuse of content are expressly prohibited by all Creative Commons licences.
He finished with a call for researchers to feel empowered to negotiate Licenses to Publish and so retain their copyright, and to embrace open licences as a means to increase access to research and its subsequent re-use: in other words, its ‘impact’.

Find a reputable OA publisher

Directory of Open Access Books (DOAB) with Janneke Adema, PhD in Media and Communication, Coventry University

Janneke Adema looked directly at the relationship between quality and OA, focusing on the services provided in this respect by the Directory of Open Access Books (DOAB), which aims to be both a discovery tool for OA books and a place to find reputable OA publishers.

She talked about vanity and predatory publishing (and Jeffrey Beal’s very extensive list of potentially predatory OA scholarly publishers) and the differences between these forms and Article Processing Charges (APCs) gold OA. She warned that, while vanity publishing and some reputable OA publishing models charge a fee upfront, quality control (peer review) and editorial services are typically offered in exchange for that fee. Predatory OA publishers, on the other hand, exploit these accepted models by charging the fee without providing the expected publishing services in return.

After that timely warning, it shouldn’t be too much of a surprise that many advocates of OA are self-confessed conservatives when it comes to peer review, out of strategic concern to combat one of the main charges levelled against OA: that it undermines peer review. But as Janneke said, one of the aims of the OA movement has been to give quality control a radical rethink, and to re-imagine how it could work for digital scholarship: think about forms of open peer review, such as Kathleen Fitzpatrick’s Planned Obsolescence, or post-publication reviews such as comments on the sidelines or reviews in journals. Janneke revealed that, interestingly, research by DOAB shows that scholars think quite positively about alternative forms of quality control.

To support researchers’ in their efforts to find reputable OA publishers, DOAB is in the process of exploring quality requirements for OA book publishers and quality control policies, something that DOAB’s research suggests will be widely welcomed. So, too, will greater transparency about procedures used (such as an icon system), as long as these standards remain flexible and open to a variety of quality control mechanisms, from editorial control to open peer review and post-publication review. DOAB aims to use the CrossMark system that is being implemented by the OAPEN Library, OAPEN-NL and OAPEN-UK, as a means to provide readers with relevant quality-related information about the publications.
Funding, mandates and embargoes – what are the options?

With Ellen Collins, Research Consultant, Research Information Network

Ellen Collins opened with some good news for academics who want to publish an open access monograph: funders will welcome your innovation. While it’s true that most funders don’t currently have open access mandates for monographs, recognising that books are very different from journals and that clear business models haven’t yet emerged, funders are nonetheless very keen to see and support experimentation by researchers.

The Wellcome Trust is the only major funder that currently mandates open access for monographs. Its new policy will fund OA fees for monographs based on original scholarly research by new grantees from October 2013, and from October 2014 for existing ones. As with journals, it is starting gently; not mandating the CC BY licence to avoid causing undue alarm for some researchers and their publishers. Wellcome was a major force in driving open access for journals and Ellen said it could be that this monograph policy offers a similar impetus towards change. But, because Wellcome is a marginal funder of HSS research leading to book publications, it’s not clear yet if its move will have a major effect on other funders. HEFCE, for example, looks set to exclude monographs from its own expected moves towards open access for the REF that follows REF 2014.

She went on to discuss some of the business models that might support the publication of an open access book. She described how ‘E is free, pay for P’ is a common model, where publishers make a basic PDF, HTML or e-Pub version available openly, but continue to charge for other electronic versions and all print versions. The electronic versions made available for free vary by publisher, and some charge an author fee for the open access versions, while others don’t. A second business model relies upon libraries or library consortia to underwrite open access costs; innovators here include Knowledge Unlatched and Open Editions. Finally, business models such as Unglue.it rely on altruism, and crowd-source funding to underwrite the costs of acquiring copyright and producing e-editions of titles. Very few publishers have clear positions on Green open access.

Ellen concluded by encouraging researchers to be bold in discussing their options with publishers. She reminded them that publishers put a lot of work into acquiring titles, and they’re not likely to rescind a book contract offer just because an author raises the issue of open access. Not all publishers currently have an open access option, and not all funders have money available to pay author fees where these are charged. This means that open access may not always be an option. But it never hurts to ask.
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Tips for promoting your OA book

With Will Brooker, Professor of Film Studies, Kingston University

Will Brooker opened his talk with the suggestion that academics who use social media are all a 'brand' to some extent. Rather than being ashamed of being, in his phrase, 'pop tarts', he suggested that we should embrace the fact, and use it to our advantage.

He did just that when he promoted his recent academic monograph, Hunting the Dark Knight, and his online superhero comic My So-Called Secret Identity, and he told delegates that that there was no vanity or ego involved in sharing his success stories with contacts, using Facebook and Twitter: just as we enjoy and applaud the successes of our friends, colleagues and students, so they appreciate ours.

Moreover, he said, when we promote our own work through public engagement or media appearances, we aren't only promoting ourselves, we are also boosting the profile of our institution, so it's entirely appropriate to let its press office know what we're doing.

He advocates overcoming the natural humility and modesty that can stop us from 'boasting' about our publications by projecting a particular aspect of your personality, with irony and humor if it feels appropriate; just as most people do when they teach. And he suggested adopting a performance of 'branding' that promotes the work while keeping a tongue-in-cheek tone: almost a self-conscious pastiche of branding. His advice in a nutshell: 'be playful, be simple, be relentless, be shameless, be serious... use soundbites.'

He also highlighted that each media contact or engagement has the potential to yield more avenues for publicity. So his overriding message was to 'say yes' – to podcasts, public lectures, to being filmed and to writing articles for the mainstream media. Focusing on visuals – using a book cover image consistently as an article illustration or as the background to lectures for instance. When writing for the popular press, cultivate an accessible style that conveys scholarly ideas in a way that general readers can understand, and work quickly: a newspaper or blog article often needs to be turned around briskly, overnight.

Above all, Will advised, be determined but also be generous and as kind as possible: support others, mentor others, and don't be shy about using your networks and contacts to achieve what you want.

Tracking your book – what you should know about altmetrics

With Lucy Montgomery, Vice Chancellors Research Fellow, Queensland University of Technology

Altmetrics are alternative metrics by which a scholarly output can be evaluated.

Several earlier speakers at the conference talked about the difficulties of tracking readership and re-use of OA books, and the need for new techniques to do so. In this presentation, Lucy Montgomery provided a brief introduction...
to one potential solution: altmetrics. She focused on the challenges and opportunities associated with the emergence of altmetrics for books, and asked whether this new measurement system might help support a shift to open access for books.

First, though, she introduced the role that metadata plays in capturing how, where, and by whom digital content is being used. She acknowledged that digital technology’s capacity to track relationships, conversations, flows of knowledge and information isn’t always benign, and that it is both powerful and deeply connected to the social web.

Altmetrics builds on the power of the social web to enable new ways of measuring the ‘impact’ of content in digital spaces as an alternative to traditional measures of impact for scholarly work, such as the much criticised Journal Impact Factor.

View from the floor...

What is the biggest opportunity for OA monographs?
“Creation of new publics”
“Exploitation of the full functionalities of the internet”
“Niche publishing”
“Enabling more people to access scholarship globally”
“Re-thinking the ‘book’”
“Collaboration”

Altmetric.com – then pointed out that, disappointingly, the current limited availability of high quality metadata for scholarly monographs means that books are more or less invisible to altmetrics software.

Clearly, something needs to change, and she concluded by discussing some of the ways in which her own project, Knowledge Unlatched, aims to ensure that high quality metadata about OA books becomes visible to emerging altmetrics tools. She encouraged humanities authors to weigh in on debates about how ‘impact’ might be defined for scholarly books in the context of emerging digital technologies.
Strand 2: Open Access books and the supply chain

For publishers, vendors and librarians

Exploring necessary changes to the established relationships between seller and buyer, and looking at changes to workflows and processes.

Intended for publishers, vendors and librarians, strand 2 explored the changes that will be necessary to establish relationships between seller and buyer, and looked at changes to workflows and processes. Its chair was Simon Bell, Head of Partnerships at the British Library.

OA and Metadata – quality assurance, transparency and CrossMark

With Michiel Thijssen, Publisher, Brill, and Rachael Lammey, Product Manager, CrossRef

In their talk, Michiel and Rachael discussed the common perception that free content may be of questionable value, and described a solution that has been developed to give readers reassurance.

That solution is CrossMark, an initiative from CrossRef that has already been successfully applied to journals and is now being piloted for book publishing by OAPEN. It is a practical way to ‘kitemark’ an article or book and enable people to keep up with changes and the peer review process even if they downloaded their own version some time ago. The CrossMark logo is added by the publisher when a book is first published, and a click on the logo allows readers to see details of updates, licensing information, publishing history, peer review and funding. It also signposts readers to the most up to date approved version – particularly important for OA works, which will have been re-used by other readers in ways that are outside the publisher’s control. As Michiel explained, it’s

“Monographs are the key carriers of knowledge in the humanities and social sciences: they are too precious not to protect”

Michiel Thijssen
essentially an extra piece of metadata that costs the publisher just a few cents when the Digital Object Identifier (DOI) is first deposited – updates are at the discretion of the publisher and are free of charge.

Challenges in the supply chain and ONIX for OA books

With Adam Purser, Bibliographic Services Manager, Palgrave Macmillan, and Graham Bell, Chief Data Architect, EDItEUR

Metadata has a crucial part to play as the supply chain gets to grips with the challenges that OA books present. “Supplier systems struggle to cope with a zero-priced product” Adam Purser

Metadata is necessary to record the ‘sale’, to make resources discoverable, and to ensure that clear, accurate information regarding licensing, re-use and funding is transmitted. So, Adam asked, how can metadata be used to improve identification of OA titles, and express associated information more accurately?

Graham Bell offered some suggestions. His organisation is a non-profit, member organisation that develops, supports and promotes metadata and identification standards for the book and journal supply chain, managing the ONIX international metadata standard. It is open source, so offers free tools and free use, and the latest version 3.0 has been developed to enable richer description of e-books and facilitate the inclusion of extra layers of information. It includes codes that can describe free of charge items and offers ways to describe books that are available in a choice of formats – Graham reported that these latest refinements still need to be ratified by EDItEUR’s members, but could be adopted early in 2014. And, he said, theoretically anything useful can be included in future metadata formats – the limits will only be defined by how much metadata people in the supply chain can handle.

Discovery and dissemination of OA monographs – A publisher’s perspective

With Veronika Spinka, SpringerOpen Books Manager, Springer

Academic publishing house Springer launched its OA books offer in 2012, since when it has taken a wide-ranging approach to ensuring that its books are disseminated as widely as possible. Veronika told delegates that the licence is the key to effective dissemination and, for this reason, Springer’s licence of choice is CC BY, the most liberal Creative Commons licence, which allows for unrestricted re-use of content as long as the source work is
given appropriate attribution. As she pointed out, this actively encourages dissemination, and other measures taken by Springer are designed to support the process further.

For end-users, who usually rely on search engines to source content, Springer’s books are search engine optimised with reference to their OA status in the title line, and Springer is in discussion with online retailers such as Amazon to try to get free versions of OA books available via their channels. Though there is no direct financial benefit for them in doing so, they have expressed interest because they want to be the go-to provider of books for their customers.

For librarians, who typically source books via catalogues, Springer’s approach is to label books clearly as OA, to highlight their OA status in ONIX, and to give libraries free OA books when they buy e-book packages. The titles are also listed in discovery services such as the new Directory of Open Access Books (DOAB), and Springer is working on new ways to get OA books highlighted in machine-readable cataloguing (MARC) records.

**Discovery and dissemination of OA monographs – A librarian’s perspective**

*With Jill Russell, Digital Assets Programme Manager, and Jon Andrews, Librarian, University of Birmingham*

"**True open access offers a useable product. Some Freemium models don’t offer anything worth having**"

Jill Russell

and reliability.

Their experience is that some early free versions of OA books have not been particularly easy to use, but they were fairly confident that the work being done now to address the problem and to aid discovery should take care of these two concerns. Reliability, however, still poses many questions, in terms of the value and accuracy of individual works, and also the long-term availability of them.

At the University of Birmingham, Jill Russell explained, the library is moving away from being a consumer of content, to managing it, curating it, and providing services to library users. They are working on ways to help

"**We’re in discussions with e-retailers to make OA books available on their platforms....they are interested because they want the best offer for their customers**"

Veronika Spinka

As we’ve already seen, dissemination is a central issue for publishers such as Springer, and librarians are concerned about the other side of the same coin. The team from Birmingham University Library described discoverability as one of the main issues that will impact the success or otherwise of OA publishing – alongside readability,
researchers find content and assess its value and relevance, and also helping researchers to manage publishing issues such as licensing, placing works in repositories, and making sure content is handled legally and correctly. In their experience, many mistakes are being made and repositories are vulnerable to legal challenge because of it. They suggest that simplifying the licensing process would help.

One nut that they feel may be harder to crack is the issue of long-term availability. If books are made freely available, how can librarians hold publishers to account if they take down the delivery platform or start to make changes that complicate the use of the work?

![Image of survey results]

**View from the floor…**

**Extent to which conference met its aims (even if those aims were not why you chose to attend)**

- Collect information which I can feed back to other people in my organisation: 5
- It is very relevant to my job: 6
- I thought it might be intellectually interesting: 4
- Meet and network with people who are interested in open access monographs: 4
- Find out what other countries are doing to support open access monographs: 4
- Improve my knowledge about business models for open access monographs: 5
- Improve my understanding of Creative Commons licensing for monographs: 5
- Improve my understanding of open access for monographs: 5

Rating 1 (did not meet at all) to 7 (met completely)
Strand 3: How can funders and policy makers support the transition to OA monographs?

For funders and policy makers

Exploring how new collaborations can support a robust research environment.

Chaired by Bas Savenije, director of the Netherlands National Library (KB) and chair of OAPEN Foundation, this strand was intended for policy makers and funders. It was the first time that funders from across Europe were in the same room to discuss open access monograph publishing, and it offered attendees an opportunity to explore how research funders and policy makers can support the transition to open access monographs, and to identify opportunities for Europe-wide co-ordination to help.

In the first part of this session examples of funding programmes and OA book projects from across Europe were presented.

United Kingdom

Mark Llewellyn, Director of Research, Arts and Humanities Research Council (AHRC)

Mark explained that the current research funding model treats dissemination as part of the research process, so its cost can be met through research funds, though few researchers take up that option.

The policy change resulting from the Finch Report means that publication fees for journal articles will no longer be part of research funding — instead, block grants will be available to fund article processing charges (APCs). But in the humanities and social sciences, articles represent just 33 per cent of publications, and for monographs, the policy remains unchanged.

Mark described how OAPEN-UK, a project being co-funded by AHRC, will explore the effect of open access monograph publishing by comparing OA books with traditionally published ones. The aim is to find out more
about the role of dissemination in the research process, and about the best way to disseminate research results in the future.

Netherlands

Annemarie Bos, Director Humanities, Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research, (NWO)

Recently, Science Europe member organisations have agreed to support the speedy transition to OA both to increase the impact of research publications and to reduce the costs of publishing.

Annemarie told delegates that NWO is committed to open access and has set up an incentive fund to encourage OA publication of NWO results. The fund covers OA publication fees for both peer reviewed articles and books, up to a maximum of €5,000, and the NWO’s strategic plan for 2015-2018 will be based on a commitment to OA.

NWO’s other steps to support OA for the humanities include making grants available to set up 17 new OA humanities journals, and supporting the adoption of OA for monographs, by becoming a partner and co-funder in OAPEN-NL, which builds on the results of the European OAPEN project. It was set up to test the publication model for OA books and to create transparency in the costs and procedures in the Dutch context, and its preliminary results show that OA leads to significant usage without having a marked effect on sales.

While NWO accepts that there will be additional costs in the transition period, Annemarie said it expects OA publishing to find a sustainable business model for all stakeholders over the longer-term.

Germany

Angela Holzer, Programme Officer, German Research Foundation (DFG)

The German Research Foundation (DFG) is a member organisation in which strategic and funding decisions are essentially made by researchers. For this reason, Angela told delegates, DFG responds to the needs of the research community, rather then taking the lead in the transition to OA.

Nonetheless, DFG has OA policies that date back to 2006, recommending that authors make their articles available in OA, with a maximum embargo of 12 months, and also that they retain their copyright. And DFG has a number of funding schemes to support OA: a fund with project-related publication expenses, with a maximum of €5,000 for books with high production costs; separate publication grants, excluding dissertations; and cooperation with academic institutions to establish institutional OA publication funds, contributing up to 75% of these funds, with a cap of €2,000 for APC’s, but excluding books.

Moving on to the next stage, the DFG issued a call for open access monographs late in 2012, aiming to learn about the practicalities such as publishing costs, workflows and business models. Requirements for output
include transparency, quality assurance, CC licence, standardised usage statistics, metadata and long-term availability. This work is ongoing.

Ralf Schimmer, Head of Scientific Information Provision, Max Planck Digital Library (MPDL)

Ralf opened his talk by telling listeners that The Max Planck Society (MPG) has started to support OA monographs in response to growing interest in OA from the humanities and social sciences research community. MPDL wants to establish a sustainable and scaleable service infrastructure, building on its substantial experience with journals while keeping in mind that monographs are a very different proposition. It has set up its own e-book platform edition-open-access.de and also started to collaborate with publishers, but has not set up central funding of OA publication costs.

Austria

Doris Haslinger, Programme Manager for stand-alone publications in Humanities and Social Sciences, Austrian Science Fund (FWF)

Doris said that FWF is driving the transition to OA monographs in Austria, and was the first research funder in Europe to include monographs in its open access policy. Back in 2011, FWF made OA a pre-condition for publication grants: it provides lump sum grants of €14,000 for OA books, or €18,000 including translations and foreign publication, and an additional grant of €2,000 for peer review. And, she said, FWF aims to improve the quality of peer review and foreign language editing and to boost visibility and impact, particularly outside the German-speaking countries. With these goals in mind, FWF started its own e-book library in 2012, deciding to make earlier publications open access and organising a new round of reviews to select which books should be included in the open access e-book library. While FWF is therefore the gatekeeper and selector of the open access titles, it leaves the work of publishing to the experts. The e-book library currently contains around 190 books, and these publications are also made available through the OAPEN Library and listed in DOAB.

The Fund’s next step is to set up a certification procedure for publishers, to make sure open access books meet rigorous academic standards, that peer review processes are improved, and that CC BY or CC BY-NC licences are used.
Sweden

Birgitta Hellmark-Lindgren, Deputy Director and Head of Communications, Stockholm University Library

Seventeen universities and six research funders in Sweden have an OA policy or recommendation, though monographs are not included. But there is a national project exploring open access book publishing in a collaborative manner, involving funders, universities and publishers. The objective is to improve dissemination through open access publishing and address the issue of quality through a common reviewing system.

Stockholm University Library is to create an OA University Press as part of its library services.

The preceding set of presentations made it clear that research funders are playing an important role in the transition to OA monograph publishing, although that role has been defined quite differently in each case. None of it is yet set in stone – all are still exploring the possibilities of what they might do to help, and some funders are involved in experiments to fund open access books.

In the transition to open access books, European research funders all face similar questions:

» Should the cost of dissemination be seen as part of the cost of research?
» What is a reasonable publication fee in the case of OA books that follow a gold type model?
» Under what licence should OA books be published?
» How should the issue of quality assurance be approached?

Even though European funders are facing similar challenges and there are opportunities for collaboration on an international level, substantial cultural and disciplinary differences remain in the ways that research funders operate and books are published across Europe.

Annemarie Bos (NWO) would welcome international co-operation to achieve a convergence in policies.

Angela Holzer (DFG) identified a European task to develop international OA infrastructures in response to the smaller infrastructures that are popping up everywhere, and Google becoming the most used resource.

Jean-Claude Guédon (University of Montreal) would like to see the development of best practice as a common European infrastructure.
Eelco Ferwerda (OAPEN) suggested a Europe-wide investigation into existing quality assurance and review practices, to devise a common approach and foster innovation.

Margo Bargheer (Göttingen University Press) recommended a top-down approach in the transition to OA monographs, because HSS researchers are on the defensive in the current research funding climate.

Angela Holzer (DFG) pointed to the different tradition in the humanities, where reputation is closely linked to being published by specific publishers and all other concerns are secondary.

Annemarie Bos concluded that research funders must implement high standards for OA publishing.

On funding models for OA books:

Saskia de Vries (Sampan) predicted that publishers would adapt to OA funding opportunities, but was concerned about high publication charges and problems with multi-authored books. She said funding bodies should use their financial strength to prevent misuse of funds.

Ralf Schimmer (MPG) suggested that transparent metadata regarding publication charges would help with this.

Lorraine Estelle (JISC Collections) said that initial findings from OA monograph studies suggest that there is little impact on print sales and questioned why funders would fund OA publication charges at all.

Saskia de Vries responded that sales were already too low to sustain monograph publishing.

A publisher who was in favour of OA books argued that there should be more attention for digitisation of backlist books.

Alessandra Tosi (Open Book Publishers) expressed concern with some of the funding models. In the case of the example given by MPG, traditional hardback publications are costly and combining publication charges with printed books can lead to double-dipping for books – perhaps, therefore, funding should be aimed more at innovation than at paying charges for OA editions alongside traditional books?

Annemarie Bos argued that this is part of the reason her organisation joined OAPEN-NL: funding agencies are interested in the impact of publications and don’t pay attention to publisher profits. Good insight into the real costs of publishing is crucial.

Someone from the British Academy argued that Gold OA assumes that there is public money available for APC’s, but that this is not the case: Margo Bargheer responded with experience gained from the EU-funded OAPEN project: to a large extent, monographs are already being subsidised. OA doesn’t mean new money needs to be brought in, but it will require a restructuring of current funding streams.

Sam Bruinsma (Brill) answered that Brill publishes 500 monographs annually, without subsidies: another speaker commented that, in reality, libraries paid for these books.

Saskia de Vries said that the OA system would work if we could make a change overnight to use existing funds for subscriptions.

Annemarie Bos agreed that the same amount of money goes into the system, but said that making the change is very complicated, as all stakeholders have their own perspective. Libraries are not funded by research funders, and funders think that OA will eventually be cheaper than the current system.
Ralf Schimmer explained that in the example he described in his presentation, the request for high quality print came from the researchers, and it was this that caused the book to be expensive – the publisher agreed to reimburse the funder if sales expectations were exceeded. He believes the future of OA lies in the Freemium model: content itself is free, but added value features and other services will provide a source of revenue.

Angela Holzer spoke about the consortium model, where libraries pay for the OA edition.

The discussion returned to the issue of double-dipping and, while it was argued in some quarters that this should not occur for ‘born digital’ publications, Angela acknowledged that it cannot be completely prevented. Unlike OA journals, in the case of books there are additional sources of revenue.

Eelco Ferwerda argued that there are already models that address the issue of double-dipping, such as in the case of publishing house De Gruyter, and also at Amsterdam University Press where, in collaboration with a research institute, revenue from sales is used to create a revolving pot of money from which new publications can be funded.

In an effort to facilitate the transition to open access publishing, OAPEN is proposing to establish a European deposit service for open access books. Such a service would improve integration into library catalogues and third party library services, and increase the discoverability and visibility of open access books. A European deposit service would also be helpful in establishing common standards for information about publications, such as metadata, original research, publication fees and usage data. In addition, a dedicated European repository for open access monographs could address the need for quality assurance by establishing and maintaining quality criteria for academic books.

Following the strands, a final series of showcases highlighted how a number of academic publishers are forging ahead with experiments on open access.

Showcase 2: MPublishing

Shana Kimball, Business Development Manager, New York Public Library

Library-based publisher MPublishing has been producing OA books for seven years, driven by demand from its authors. Mpublishing also supports Open Humanities Press with its publishing infrastructure and services. Shana said that its successes in this area to date have been supported by goodwill, and that while organisations at all points in the supply chain are excited about the possibilities and are experimenting with potential models, few are claiming to make a profit from OA. The challenge for MPublishing now is to streamline and simplify the processes, to spread the risk and make OA publishing less vulnerable when money becomes tighter or stakeholders’ priorities shift.

“\'I’m anxious about a model that relies on goodwill and voluntary assistance\’”

Shana Kimball
MPublishing’s proposed solution is to develop cross-library partnerships that share both risk and cost, and pool expertise. With this in mind, they are planning to join initiatives such as Knowledge Unlatched, with a view to scaling up and accelerating the process of scholarly publishing.

Showcase 2: Open Monograph Press at Heidelberg

Andrea Hacker, Managing Editor, University of Heidelberg

The University of Heidelberg is another institutional publisher with a strong track record in OA: it produces 14 OA journals, operates an OA green repository, and its historic literature has been digitised. But it has not yet produced its own OA books, and Andrea Hacker told the conference that the hesitancy was born of concern about constraining authors’ freedom.

"Open access is here to stay – funders are demanding it”
Andrea Hacker

Nonetheless, she said, the demand is clearly building and so the university is running a pilot in the form of a book series in English by PhD students – ‘Heidelberg Studies in Transculturality’. Quality is a top priority as the university seeks to address persistent concerns over the intellectual rigour and value of content that is made available for free: the sustainability of the publishing model and the long-term availability of the books are also high on the university’s agenda. It will be working with partner organisations to share both expertise and workload.

The cost of production is estimated at around €6,500 per book, and the university will probably adopt a hybrid model to cover those costs, though this is still to be confirmed. The project started in September 2013, and its successes and problems will be shared as they happen via a project blog and tweets.

Showcase 2: Hybrid Publishing Lab

Simon Worthington and Mercedes Bunz, Hybrid Publishing Lab

Hybrid Publishing Lab conducts research to help universities and small publishing firms keep up with technological advances in digital publishing. Simon opened with a description of experiments such as ‘BookSprint’, designed to get authors to collaborate, merging writing and peer review processes to get books published in less than a week. He said that initiatives such as this are making it possible to rethink the university press completely, and demonstrate that it can be very quick and easy to produce quality work and upload it to the internet. Getting that book into library catalogues is a much larger challenge, and this is where Hybrid is currently focusing some of its efforts.
And, in a bid to create a fully open infrastructure for publishing, Hybrid has launched a three-year project – Hybrid Publishing Consortium – to develop open source software that will make it quick, inexpensive and easy to create books in multiple formats.

“The fundamentals of publishing are in flux”
Mercedes Bunz

Closing Keynote

Cameron Neylon
Advocacy Director, Public Library of Science (PLoS)

“You’re welcome to take away whatever you like [from this talk] and use it however you like….it’s far preferable to you going away and doing nothing at all with it”

Cameron Neylon

Billed as a ‘well-known agitator’ for OA, Cameron ended the conference with a high-energy, entertaining talk set against a backdrop of 60 randomly repeating slides. He distilled the conversation right back to its essence with his comment that the presentations over the previous couple of days had been exploring different aspects of the tension between the comforting desire for the fixed nature of the traditional printed monograph, and what that monograph is actually for. A scientist himself, he recognises that, in the humanities above all other disciplines, the monograph is really about the conversations that will arise from it, and the context that these give. His thought on that: “The context matters more than the content”.

“A book will always have its role…. But the opportunity is to use a technology built for discourse to create an unprecedented good for scholarship.”

All presentations are available on the OAbooks SlideShare channel and you can also watch Cameron’s full talk here.
Recommendations

» Researchers and publishers should be open to exploring innovative funding sources to ensure that monograph publishing is not governed by saleability. Authors’ fees, university grants, research centre partnerships, library consortia, funder subsidies, and crowd sourcing are just a few alternatives to relying on book sales.

» The research community has to devise new ways to reward and recognise original work, so that the outmoded concept of authorship can be replaced with a new focus on collaborative working to create better scholarship. This includes new metrics for assessing impact.

» Similarly, it will be necessary to experiment and devise new models for peer review, and new ways to ensure that reviewers act both responsible and reliably.

» Senior academics will have to lead from the front as researchers move towards Open Access (OA). Early career academics will find it harder to embrace OA while they are still anxious to establish their reputation.

» OA gives us the opportunity to foster genuine two-way dialogue with academics in developing countries. We need to develop strategies for OA publishing that nurture that.

» We need action to decide who makes the final decision about licensing. Should it be the funder, the researcher or the publisher? Funders currently have the upper hand – do we want (or need) to alter that? (Joselyn Upendran)

» Publishers who adopt a Freemium publishing model for OA will have to focus on creating clear distinctions between content (openly available) and added-value services (charged for), to make OA publishing sustainable.

» We need tools and strategies to ensure user confidence in OA monographs.

» We need measures to ensure discoverability of OA content in library catalogues, discovery services, and in search engines.

» We need to develop strategies to ensure readability of OA content, and also to make sure content will be available and useable for the long haul: libraries are concerned that, with no contracts with publishers, they will not be able to call on them for help when things go wrong.

» We need incentives to encourage researchers to embrace OA enough to digitise and make available their primary sources and to embrace the opportunities that technology provides to make the future of the book a truly interactive and collaborative venture.

» We need to develop metadata standards to serve the needs of OA monographs, to aid discoverability, support use and citation, and capture author and funding information.

» Libraries need to re-engineer their services and move towards a model that helps researchers find and assess the value of content, and also helps them manage their licensing and publishing obligations efficiently and legally.
Further information

This report is a summary of the Open Access Monographs in the Humanities and Social Sciences Conference and is available online at: jisc-collections.ac.uk/reports/oabooksreport

The organisers of the conference, Eelco Ferwerda and Caren Milloy would like to thank all the speakers and chairs for their contributions to a successful conference. With special thanks to Martin Hall, Vice-Chancellor, University of Salford for chairing the conference and writing the introduction to this report.

They would also like to thank Christine Gormley of Seachange Communications for her assistance in bringing the report together.

The videos and presentations from the conference are all available online at:

Videos: youtube.com/user/oabooks

Presentations: slideshare.net/oabooks

For enquiries, please contact:

Caren Milloy, Head of Projects, Jisc Collections on c.milloy@jisc-collections.ac.uk

and

Eelco Ferwerda, Director, OAPEN Foundation on e.ferwerda@oapen.org
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