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Overview

1. What do we mean by “Open Access?”
2. What conditions are librarians responding to when they support open access models?
3. What concerns do librarians have about open access?
4. A gesture toward conclusions
1. Open Access: 
A Coat of Many Colors
Open Access: Content Models

• Journals
• Article repositories
  – Preprints
  – Corrected manuscripts
  – Post-prints
• Ancillary content (e.g., primary data, field notes)
Open Access: *Review Models*

- Peer-reviewed
- Self-archived without review
Open Access: *Repository Models*

- Centralized (e.g., PubMed Central)
- Distributed / federated
- Disciplinary
- Institutional
Open Access: *Copyright Models*

- Most rights retained by author (BOAI, Berlin Declaration)
- Most rights retained by publisher
Open Access: *Business Models*

- Embargoed access (*Molecular and Cellular Biology*)
- Immediate access (*Public Library of Science*)

- Revenue derived from
  - Submission ("Author") fees (*Public Library of Science*)
  - Institutional subvention (*Journal of Insect Science*)
  - Endowment (*Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*)
  - Advertising
2. Higher Education and Academic Libraries
Public Higher Education
Budgets: 2005

• State Funding Decreased: 8
• Increased 0-2.9%: 22
• Increased 3% or more: 22

“In the budgets that states adopted for the 2004-5 fiscal year, total appropriations for higher education rose by 3.8 percent, to $63-billion, from the year before.”

“In seven states where higher-education spending rose this year, the increases were not enough to make up for previous cuts and left college budgets lower than they were two years before.”

Library Expenditures as a Percent of University Expenditures for 40 ARL Libraries, 1982-2002

Copyright Association of Research Libraries, 2005
Graph 4

Expenditure Trends

Serial Expenditures (+260%)
Library Materials (+206%)
TOTAL (+128%)
Total Salaries (+116%)
Operating Expenditures (+84%)
CPI (+68%)
Monograph Expenditures (+66%)

Operational Challenges to Libraries

- Digital/print duplication = Parallel operations
  - Most students and faculty prefer digital
  - Dual formats require parallel operations
  - Most libraries are cancelling print when digital is available
- Licensing
- Other new responsibilities for libraries and librarians
Libraries and Research Support

- Increase in amount of published scholarship
  - Doubling of NIH funding
- Increased interdisciplinarity (implications for “core” journal collections)
- Increased emphasis on research funding without an increase in distribution from research overhead
F&A Rates for Libraries

Total Libraries Surveyed: 27

- Fixed (Unknown) Amount 5
- 0% 15
- 1-2% 4
- 2-3% 2
- over 3% 3
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Libraries in the STM Market

- Serial Unit Cost (+226%)
- Serial Expenditures (+192%)
- Monograph Unit Cost (+66%)
- CPI (+57%)
- Monograph Expenditures (+48%)
- Serials Purchased (-7%)
- Monographs Purchased (-17%)


% Change Since 1986:
- Serial Unit Cost: 0%, 25%, 50%, 75%, 100%, 125%, 150%, 175%, 200%, 225%, 250%
- Serial Expenditures: 0%, 25%, 50%, 75%, 100%, 125%, 150%, 175%, 200%, 225%, 250%
- Monograph Unit Cost: 0%, 25%, 50%, 75%, 100%, 125%, 150%, 175%, 200%, 225%, 250%
- CPI: 0%, 25%, 50%, 75%, 100%, 125%, 150%, 175%, 200%, 225%, 250%
- Monograph Expenditures: 0%, 25%, 50%, 75%, 100%, 125%, 150%, 175%, 200%, 225%, 250%
- Serials Purchased: 0%, 25%, 50%, 75%, 100%, 125%, 150%
- Monographs Purchased: 0%, 25%, 50%, 75%, 100%, 125%, 150%
Mergers and Acquisitions

• Increasing merger activity in the commercial STM market: e.g.,
  – Elsevier / Pergamon: 1991
  – Elsevier / Harcourt: 2001
  – Cinden & Conover / BertelsmannSpringer: 2003
  – Cinden & Conover / Kluwer: 2003

• Increasing evidence that mergers cause price increases: a non-competitive market
Subscription Costs: 2005

- Rate of increase for subscription prices appears to be moderating (7-9% in 2005 compared with 9-11%)
- Consortial licensing and bundling of titles is reducing unit costs
- Weakness of the dollar against the euro and pound is a concern
Botany

- Average Cost 2005: $1109
- Percent Change 2004-2005: 9%
- Percent Change 2001-2005: 36%

Zoology

- Average Cost 2005: $1053
- Percent Change 2004-2005: 7%
- Percent Change 2001-2005: 28%

The Scaling of Inflation

KU 2005/6 Budget for Subscriptions of all Kinds (Print Journals, Journal Packages, Databases, etc.): $3,744,319

- 5% = $187,216 additional for the next year or 9 Graduate Research Assistants @ $20,000
- 7% = $262,102 additional or 13 GRAs
- 9% = $336,989 additional or 17 GRAs
Library Values

• Academic control over scholarly publishing
  – Strong support for scholarly societies
• Access to scholarship as a public interest
  – Digital information as a “public good”
  – The circle of gifts
  – Tax exemption and tax-funded research
  – Citizen interest in science policy
3. Librarians’ Concerns about Open Access
Questions about Open Access

Transparency of institutional payments in an “author-pay” model

• How much will each institution pay and how will we know?

• What market forces will constrain submission fees?
Questions about Open Access

Cost distribution and equity

• Should research-producing institutions pay all the costs?
• Will free riding damage the system?
• Does the public good extend to the corporate sector?
Questions about Open Access

Stability over time

• Who will take responsibility for archiving?
• What revenue stream will support file maintenance, format migration, etc.?
4. Gestures Toward Some Conclusions
• We need reliable, diverse, and continuing revenue streams to support:
  – Administration of peer review
  – Discovery and navigation
  – Preservation
• We need controls on the cost of these services:
  – Increased efficiency in production/distribution
  – Market-based constraints on price
• Open access to content may introduce market constraint and stimulate innovation:
  – Limited-term embargos
  – Paid access to value-added services (“overlay journals”)
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• Market forces may not be adequate to address equity and public-good concerns
  – Regulation or self-discipline?
Additional Sources


• Slide 16: Steven Harris, informal survey, Greater Western Libraries Alliance, March 2005

• Slide 18: http://www.arl.org/newsltr/218/costimpact.html#graph
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