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• The Goal
• The Problem
• A Short-Term Policy
• A Long-Term Policy
“First, the [FAS research] policy should encourage the notion that ideas or creative works produced at the University should be used for the greatest possible public benefit. This would normally mean the **widest possible dissemination** and use of such ideas or materials.”

Harvard Faculty of Arts and Sciences “Grey Book”
Publisher Services

- Logistics of peer review process
- Vetting, filtering, imprimatur
- Production
  - Copy-editing, typesetting, graphic design, layout
- Distribution
  - Networked access
  - Printing, binding, shipping
The Problem
Serial expenditures %+
CPI %+
HU serial expenditures %+

ARL Statistics 2005-06, 07, 08
http://octavia.zoology.washington.edu/publishing/pageprice_table.html
http://octavia.zoology.washington.edu/publishing/pageprice_table.html
“Many publishers argue that costs cannot be reduced much, even with electronic publishing, since most of the cost is the first-copy cost of preparing the manuscripts for publication. This argument is refuted by the widely differing costs among publishers. The great disparity in costs among journals is a sign of an industry that has not had to worry about efficiency. Another sign of lack of effective price competition is the existence of large profits.”

Andrew Odlyzko, 1997, The Economics of Electronic Journals
Causes of the Failure

1. Access is a monopolistic good
   • Monopoly protected by copyright law
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2. Moral hazard
   • Overconsumption of a good by a consumer who is insulated from the good's cost
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The Short Term Approach
A Faculty-Wide Rights Retaining Open Access Policy
1. **Permission:** Each Faculty member grants to the President and Fellows of Harvard College permission to make available his or her scholarly articles and to exercise the copyright in those articles.

2. **Waiver:** The Dean or the Dean's designate will waive application of the policy for a particular article upon express direction by a Faculty member.

3. **Deposit:** Each Faculty member will provide an electronic copy of the author’s final version of each article ... no later than the date of its publication.
Selected Rights Retention OA Policies

- 2/12/08 Harvard Faculty of Arts and Sciences
- 5/1/08 Harvard Law School
- 6/10/08 Stanford School of Education
- 3/10/09 Harvard Kennedy School of Government
- 3/18/09 Massachusetts Institute of Technology
- 4/30/09 University of Kansas
- 6/1/09 Harvard Graduate School of Education
- 11/20/09 Oberlin College
- 10/27/09 Trinity University
- 2/12/10 Harvard Business School
- 3/18/10 Duke University
- 11/15/10 Harvard Divinity School
Advantages of the policy

1. Makes a collective statement of principle
2. Completely clarifies rights situation
3. Allows university to facilitate article deposit process
4. Allows university to negotiate collectively
5. Opt-out versus opt-in increases rights retention
What the policy doesn’t do

• Serve as a replacement for journal publication
• Threaten the viability of journals
• Address the underlying economic dysfunction
The Long Term Approach
Support for a Sustainable Business Model
Dystopia

1. All universities follow suit
2. All articles available open access
3. Libraries feel freer to cancel subscriptions
4. Price pressure on journal subscription fees
5. Journals cannot recoup costs
6. Publishers cannot change business model of journals
7. Journals (scholarly societies, peer review, ...) disappear
Publisher Services

- Logistics of peer review process
- Vetting, filtering, imprimatur
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Publisher Services

- **First copy costs**
  - Logistics of peer review process
  - Vetting, filtering, imprimatur
  - Production
  - Copy-editing, typesetting, graphic design, layout
  - Distribution
    - Networked access
  - Printing, binding, shipping

- **Per-access costs**
“[F]rom a societal perspective, electronic publication and more widespread circulation should be encouraged. The best means for accomplishing this objective is subsidization of the fixed cost of publication, so that publishers would need to rely on subscriptions only to recover distribution costs.”

Roger Noll, 1996, The Economics of Scholarly Publications and the Information Superhighway
“Each of the undersigned universities commits to the timely establishment of durable mechanisms for underwriting reasonable publication charges for articles written by its faculty and published in fee-based open-access journals and for which other institutions would not be expected to provide funds.”

Compact for Open-Access Publishing Equity
www.oacompact.org
COPE Signatories

- Cornell University
- Dartmouth College
- Harvard University
- Massachusetts Institute of Technology
- University of California at Berkeley
- University of Ottawa
- Columbia University
- Memorial Sloan-Kettering Cancer Center
- University of Michigan
- Universitat de Barcelona
- Duke University
- University of Calgary
- Simon Fraser University
COPE Supporters
Nobelists

- Mario Capecchi
- Robert Curl
- Edmond H. Fischer
- Alfred Gilman
- Paul Greengard
- Dudley Herschbach
- Roald Hoffmann
- Robert Horvitz
- Roger Kornberg
- Kary Mullis
- Stanley Prusiner
- Jack W. Szostak
- Rolf Zinkernagel
COPE Supporters
Open Access Leaders

- Steven Hyman
- Heather Joseph
- Peter Lange
- Peter Suber
- John Wilbanks
- John Willinsky
COPE Supporters

Institutions

- BioMed Central
- Creative Commons
- Hindawi Publishing
- Open Access Scholarly Publishers Association (OASPA)
- Public Library of Science (PLoS)
- Scholarly Publishing and Academic Resources Coalition (SPARC)
- Wellcome Trust
Questions (& answers)

1. Won’t this cost universities a lot of money?
2. What about authors with fewer financial resources such as those from developing countries?
3. Won’t publishers just hyperinflate publication charges to maintain revenue?
4. The OA fund idea only works if essentially all research institutions sign on.
5. Won’t faculty at poorly endowed universities be disenfranchised from publishing in top OA journals?
6. Won’t heavy-research universities end up paying more than under the subscription model?
Conclusion

- *Open access* is and should be our goal.
- There is a *systemic failure* in the scholarly publishing market preventing reaching that goal.
- In the short term, open-access policies can *mitigate the problem*.
- In the long term, we need an *alternative business model*, and should begin supporting it now by policy.