

UUK OA Monograph group

Meeting: 2

Practical Information

Thursday 29 June 2017

2.30pm – 4.30pm

Room: Boardroom

UUK Woburn House, Tavistock Square, London

Group Information

Chair: Shearer West (University of Sheffield)

Secretariat: Helen Snaith (HEFCE)

Attendees:

Allison McCaig	ARMA
Alison Jones	OUP
Chris Banks	Imperial College, London
David Prosser	Research Libraries UK
Gary Grubb	AHRC
Graham Stone	Jisc
Helen Snaith	HEFCE
Janneke Adema	Coventry University
Lara Speicher	UCL
Maja Maricevic	British Library
Martin Eve	Open Library of the Humanities
Martin Halliwell	AHA
Nicola Ramsey	Edinburgh University Press
Ros Pyne	Springer/Nature
Rupert Gatti	Open Book Publishers (OBP)
Shearer West	University of Sheffield

Minutes (v.1)

1. Introductions and apologies

1.1 The Chair welcomed members to the second meeting of the UUK OA Monograph subgroup. Apologies were received from Professor Susan Bruce, Hannah Hope, Kitty Inglis, Professor Roger Kain, and Professor Nigel Vincent.

2. Minutes and matters arising

2.2 Members were invited to approve the minutes of the last meeting of the OA monograph subgroup held on Wednesday 15 February 2017. It was noted that both Cambridge University Press and Manchester University Press have increased their fees for OA monographs.

ACTION: The increase in costs will be referenced in a footnote in the minutes of the previous meeting.

3. Actions arising from previous meeting:

3.1 Discussion paper: Budget transition for OA monographs (Martin Eve)

3.1.1 In the first meeting of the OA monograph group, one of the central discussions was around potential funding streams for OA monographs. In response to this discussion, a subgroup of members was established to assess a series of options and documented assumptions for a transition to OA monographs. The subgroup (Martin Eve, Lara Speicher, Kitty Inglis, Graham Stone and David Prosser) have submitted a discussion paper for the purposes of the OA monograph group. The points of discussion put forward in the discussion paper are ideas from the subgroup, and may not represent the ideas and opinions of all members of the OA monograph group.

3.1.2 The paper suggests that:

- i. Given the timings for the REF after next (mid-2020s), we should ensure economic sustainability in order to comply with HEFCE's (proposed) mandate of OA monographs.
- ii. The paper assumes that there is a payment to process within the workflow of OA monographs, and estimates these costs at around £7,500 per book.¹ The paper acknowledges that costs for OA may vary widely from publisher to publisher. To note: under competition law publishers are subject to legal restrictions surrounding

¹ The fee levels referred to in the paper refer to the market rate at the time of writing. The sample list of publishers used for the purposes of the report have been taken from Ellen Collins, Caren Milloy and Graham Stone's 'Guide to Open Access Monograph Publishing for Researchers', ed. James Baker, Martin Paul Eve, and Ernesto Priego (Jisc Collections, 2015).

the discussion of setting of price levels, particularly in conversation with a number of publishers represented alongside various institutions.

- iii. Given the number of monographs and book chapters submitted to the last REF, the paper estimates that around £19.2m per year is required to successfully transition to OA monographs. This is assuming a liberal approach of 75% submission rate of monographs and assumes that the remaining 25% will be exempt (e.g. due to third party rights, trade books etc.)
- iv. Institutional library budgets on their own will not cover a transition to OA monographs.
- v. We should recognise that there should be mixed approaches in the funding allocation to address this issue.
- vi. Moving towards 25% of gold OA for monographs would be a positive culture change. We need to be realistic about scale.

Members were invited to comment on the Budget Transition discussion paper.

3.1.3 Three points were made in regard to the scale of activity captured in the report. Firstly, the paper only refers to monographs submitted to the REF (under a presumed mandate). We should not lose sight of other books that are published by UK academics that do not get submitted to the REF. Secondly, the group may wish to consider the international element and publication behaviours with UK authors and publishers in Europe and North America (and more widely). Finally, the diversity of publishers involved in the OA landscape should be considered. Simon Tanner's report on REF 2014 Panel D outputs refers to over 1200 publishers involved in the exercise (although just four publishers were responsible for publishing just under half the number of monographs). Members recognised that setting up gold OA with 1200 is going to be a challenge. The group should be realistic about the scale of ambition in any future activities it carries out.

3.1.4 The group sought some clarification over the National Level Licensing Agreement. This refers to deals made upfront with publishers for authors to publish OA with no further fee. According to OUP figures, some publishers have a caveat that costs can go up. Adoption of a NLLA model is a restrictive competitive market, although may be an effective mechanism to transition to OA.

3.1.5 The group noted that there are increasing incentives to publish green OA and Goldsmith UP have already adopted this model. However, it was noted that when the transition of OA for journals was discussed the main driver was from STEM subjects, rather than from the Arts and Humanities. Should we repeat the same model as journals? This may not be entirely appropriate for monographs. Frameworks, platforms and services available all facilitated the movement to OA for journals. In order to find a reasonable embargo period for Green OA we should find out when the decay of sales begins. It is difficult to imagine this as any shorter than the current Arts and Humanities journal embargo (24 months).

3.1.6 Based on the information put forward in the discussion paper, members agreed that they would use the budget transition report as a springboard to future activities. These include:

- i. Carrying out a pilot activity to promote the transition to OA monographs.
- ii. Exploring green OA models.
- iii. Carrying out further discussions with UKRI.

3.1.7 Any pilot activity that the group may undertake has to encourage **cultural change**. We need to acknowledge that there is not 'one size fits all' and that there will be a diverse range of funding and business models in any transition to OA monographs. We need to avoid OA monographs from becoming a marginal activity and need to it be streamlined enough for it be the 'norm'. Analysis carried out by Simon Tanner shows that 27% of monographs were published in the year before the cut-off date for REF 2014. This signals that we do have time for cultural change. It was noted that there has been no shortage of uptake on OA when it has been offered to staff at UCL.

3.1.8 If UK monograph budgets are too small then we may wish to consider **allocating money centrally (e.g. through a block grant) or looking at changing behaviours of budget allocations within institutions**. We should also consider the number of books that may be submitted to the REF. If a book is 4* and double weighted then we may see a trend whereby less books are submitted (with more submitting as a double weighting). This may have potentially perverse behaviours in REF submissions, with less monographs submitted.

3.1.9 A pilot also needs to be structured in such a way that it would support the 'long tail' of publishers and reflect the ecology of mixed models.

3.1.12 Members also noted that we can draw comparisons with the REF impact pilot. This pilot activity worked as it encompassed a broad range of disciplines. We should recognise that there are different areas within the arts and humanities landscape. **Any pilot should be carried out within 3-4 distinct areas ranging from the empirical to the more creative in order to give the community confidence.**

3.1.13 There may be some background requirements to pilot activity carried out by the group. **For example, it would be useful to compare the number of titles returned to the REF2014 to availability in institutional libraries.** It was noted that at the moment libraries receive requests on what to purchase: this could be in conflict with institutional REF submissions. COPAC data could help to understand library purchases in the UK.

3.2 Concordat (update from Helen Snaith on behalf of Roger Kain)

3.2.1 In the first meeting members noted that OA monographs are often perceived less favourably during promotion and recruitment processes. One of the actions arising from the first meeting was to propose recommendations outlining an (optional) agreement committing universities to assess OA monographs on their own merits in funding, appointment and promotion considerations.

3.2.2. This action point was discussed at the **UUK OA Coordination group** (April 2017). Members were of the opinion that there is a 'concordat fatigue' in the sector, and that the OA monograph subgroup should not take the approach that is being proposed. Furthermore, UUK may be carrying out some work to review their current concordats. Any revisions to the concordats by UUK will consult with the OA monograph group where appropriate.

3.2.3 Therefore, the most appropriate form of action may be to park the proposal for a HEI 'agreement' for now. The OA symposium (agenda item 3.3) may also feed into any future agreement.

3.3. Fostering a dialogue with the HE sector

3.3.1 As part of the actions arising from the first OA monographs meeting, Professor Susan Bruce (AHA) was asked to consider the ways in which to foster a dialogue with the sector around the benefits and anxieties of OA monographs. Working with Martin Halliwell (co-chair, AHA), Janneke Adema, Nigel Vincent, Roger Kain and the AHRC, Professor Bruce has proposed to hold an OA monograph symposium.

The group were invited to discuss the proposals put forward by the AHA. Comments are captured below.

3.3.2 Considering the diversity of stakeholder involved in the OA landscape, it may be more appropriate to host a series of symposiums, rather than one single event. This would provide us with an opportunity to target key stakeholders and understand anxieties and barriers specific to stakeholder groups. Members also noted that we do not just want to only invite advocates of OA to the events. There needs to be a dialogue with the broader research community and its open research agenda. Invitees could include PVCs (Research), ECRs, learned societies, subject associations, as well as those who work in research and communications roles within HEIs.

3.3.4 Members also considered the possibility of developing a dialogue with the sector by attending external meetings to discuss thoughts around OA monographs.

ACTION: Identify the scholarly community we wish to engage with.

3.3.5 The British Academy hold one policy workshop a year on a key theme – this could be OA monographs in 2018. UCL are also holding an international UP conference in early 2018. This will include discussions on OA in terms of policy and presses.

4. OA Monograph Citations and Impact Factors (Alison Jones, OUP)

4.1 At the last meeting we discussed scholarly impact and investigation into citations. There is very little evidence on the link between open access and citation levels for monographs. One study² identified a small positive effect of OA publishing on citation scores after the titles had been open access for five years but concluded that the effect of OA is not as profound for books as it is for journals, the results were more nuanced and further investigation was warranted. There may be scope to look at more data and citation impact factor and we could possibly use titles that were used in the OAPEN-UK study as a starting point for this. To note, members cautioned the use of citation and impact data as indicators of ‘good’ research. Some concern was also expressed over the use of OAPEN-UK as a sample set as not many publishers used in the study didn’t had the ability to clearly demonstrate where a title was OA on their website.

² R. Snijder ‘Revisiting an open access monograph experiment: measuring citations and tweets 5 years later’ *Scientometrics* (2016) 109:1855-1875

4.2 When analysing citations we should take account of:

- i. The citation culture across different disciplines and some may need a longer period to accumulate citations, particularly in the humanities. Between five and ten years seems like the best timeframe for analysis, earlier than this is likely to have far fewer citations. For example, OUP published its earliest OA books in 2012, so they are only just approaching a time for gathering meaningful evidence.
- ii. English language publications are also more likely to be cited, so we should account for that.

4.2 Springer/Nature are currently carrying out a project that is looking at the link between citation and impact data. This will be complete by the end of 2017. Members commented that it would be useful to share this methodology as it could be used as a grounding for any future activity the group may want to carry out.

ACTION: Springer/Nature to share methodology of the citation project, when available.

5. Jisc reports and draft papers

5.1 The following reports were circulated to members prior to the meeting:

- i. Jisc Collections' Open Access Monographs Offering (Annex D).
- ii. Changing publishing ecologies attached (Annex E)
- iii. A Landscape Study on Open Access and Monographs (Annex F)

5.2 Members were invited to reflect upon the reports, which showcase the latest work carried out on OA monographs.

5.3 The group recommended that it would be useful to produce a synthesis report summarising the work that has been carried out on OA monographs. The report could capture the key findings of reports that have been published on the topic, and highlight the benefits of OA monographs to a range of stakeholder. The synthesis report would then be used to disseminate to external stakeholders.

ACTION: Lara Speicher to lead on producing an OA synthesis report.

6. Actions to take forward to the next meeting (see p. 8)

7. AOB

ANNEX A

7.1 BL and SAS are carrying out a survey on digital humanities that should be completed in the next few months

ANNEX A

Ref	Theme	Action	Owner(s)	Status
103	Funding	Propose recommendations to take forward to the UUK OA Coordination group on how best to approach a transition in HEI library budgets towards OA monographs.	Martin Eve (OLH)	Complete
104	Education and communication	Propose recommendations to take forward to the UUK OA Coordination outlining an (optional) agreement committing universities to assess OA monographs on their own merits in funding, appointment, and promotion considerations.	Roger Kain (SAS)	Postponed
105	Education and communication	Foster a dialogue about the benefits of and impediments to OA monographs in the HE sector	Susan Bruce (AHA)	Ongoing
106	Data and information	Conduct a 'fact-finding' exercise on what work has currently been carried out on OA (including metrics and alt-metrics). Use this to inform action point 105. Data required should be identified at action point 105 first.	TBC.	Evolved into Ref 110
107	Administrative	Reflect increase in costs from MUP in minutes from previous meeting	Helen Snaith	Complete
108	Education and communication	Identify scholarly communities to target as part of the group's engagement activities.	Helen Snaith (with AHRC)	Ongoing
109	Data and information	Springer/Nature to share methodology of the citation project, when available.	Ros Pyne	Ongoing
110	Data and information	Lara Speicher to lead on producing an OA synthesis report.	Lara Speicher	Ongoing
111	Pilot	Shape pilot activity	All	Ongoing

Overview of outputs

1. Synthesis report

- A 5-6 page literature review that summarises the work that has been carried out on OA monographs. The synthesis report will:
 - Summarise key findings of reports focusing on OA monographs
 - Highlight benefits of OA monographs to a range of stakeholders
 - Be used to disseminate to external stakeholders that the group wishes to engage with in the transition to OA monographs.

2. Outreach

- An outreach programme will engage with key stakeholders within the sector. These include (but are not limited to): University VCs, PVCs (Research), ECRs, publishers (traditional and new), librarians, research managers, policy-makers, research councils and funders. The aims of the outreach programme are to initiate a dialogue with the sector around the anxieties and issues perceived with publishing monographs open access. Events will also serve as a means in which to share the benefits of OA across a range of stakeholders.

The outreach programme will take a dual approach:

a. Workshops series

- We will host a series of invitation-only workshops/ symposiums targeted at key stakeholders. The objectives of the workshops is to foster a dialogue with the sector in order to understand, and (as far as possible) alleviate some of the anxieties around OA. These events will also provide a space in which to share positive stories about OA and demonstrate examples of good practice by those already involved in the process. A formal output (e.g. a short publication or report) will be produced at the end of the series.

b. Representation at external meetings and events.

- In order to take a proactive approach to understanding discipline-specific issues pertaining to OA monographs we will attend relevant external events and meetings to engage with the sector. Groups to target may include (but are not limited to): DASHH, subject associations, learned societies, PVCs (research).

3. Pilot study

A pilot study will build upon work carried out for the Budget Transition Report and the synthesis report identified at point (1). The pilot aims to explore potential business models and funding streams that may be used in a transition to OA for monographs.

- Development of a pilot is still in its tentative stages, and the group is currently considering the form that this project will take. The following issues could be addressed through a pilot:
 - How to encourage a greater portion of books to be published by low cost publishers.

ANNEX A

- How to encourage innovative ways of accessing OA books (e.g. through subscription models such as Knowledge Unlatched).
- How to support a mixed ecology of publishers in the transition to OA.