

Update on the Scholarly Publishing Roundtable

STM 2010 Spring Annual Conference
Cambridge, MA
27-29 April 2010

H. Frederick Dylla

Executive Director and CEO
American Institute of Physics

Public access debate: pro voices

- Taxpayer pays [*for research*], taxpayer should have access [*to results*]
- Furthers innovation, science, public health, and economic development
- Ensures accountability and transparency
- Plays into the goals of researchers to be known--read and cited

Public access debate: cautionary voices

- Possible negative effect on health and sustainability of scholarly publications
- Peer review, quality, stability of the current system—potential casualties
- Academic freedom to publish curtailed
- Government intervention and unfunded mandates

Common ground?

- Economic pressures apply to all.
- Scholarly publications essential to science and scholarship.
- Disruptive and unsustainable transitions in the business models could disturb scholarship.
- The polarization prevents solutions.
- Government could be a valuable partner.

Scholarly Publishing Roundtable

Convened by the Committee on Science and Technology of the United States House of Representatives, in coordination with the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP)

Issued report on January 12, 2010

<http://science.house.gov/press/PRArticle.aspx?NewsID=2710>

Charge

“to explore and develop an appropriate consensus regarding access to and preservation of federally funded research information that addresses the needs of all interested parties.”

Participants

Academia	Libraries	Publishers
John Vaughn (AAU, Chair)	Ann Okerson (Yale)	Y.S. Chi (Elsevier)
Richard McCarty (Vanderbilt)	Scott Plutchak (Alabama)	M. Patterson (PLoS)
David Campbell (Boston)	Paul Courant (Michigan)	Fred Dylla (AIP)
Jim O'Donnell (Georgetown)		Crispin Taylor (ASPB)

Researchers: Phil Davis (Cornell), Carol Tenopir (Tennessee) and Don King (UNC)

Shared principles

- **Peer review** must continue its critical role in maintaining high quality and editorial integrity.
- **Adaptable business models** will be necessary to sustain the enterprise in an evolving landscape.
- **Scholarly and scientific publications can and should be more broadly accessible** with improved functionality to a wider public and the research community.

Shared principles, cont'd

- Sustained **archiving and preservation** are essential complements to reliable publishing methods.
- The results of research need to be published and maintained in ways that maximize the possibilities for **creative reuse** and **interoperation** among sites that host them.

Core recommendation

- Government to develop public access policies
- Expeditious but cautious approach
- Free public access—the desired outcome
- When? ASAP after publication

Some specifics

- No specific regulatory or legislative solution
- Consultative process
- Field-dependent, agency-specific embargo periods
- Flexibility
- Balance
- Interoperability
- Version of Record (VoR)

Achieving balance

- Validating the need for and potential of increased access to scholarly articles
- Preserving the essential functions of scholarly publishing
- Recognizing and considering interests of all stakeholders
- Urging collaboration among all involved
- Validating government's role as a partner

Stakeholder feedback

- Industry associations (PSP, STM) issued official responses
- Publishing industry/academic/library media covered the news
- AAU will be issuing a supporting statement

Muted and measured reactions

Most stakeholders applaud:

- Respect for the approach
- Support of the general principles
- Support for the recommended consultative process

Muted and measured reactions

Societies and for-profit publishers express:

- Reservations about property and copyright issues and government intervention
- Concern about unfunded public access policies that could threaten the viability of scholarly publishing enterprise
- Differing opinions on embargo periods of ~12 months sufficient to recoup publisher investment
- Differing opinions for the recommendation that publishers provide access to the article's Version of Record (VoR)

Muted and measured reactions

Advocates of a legislative mandate express:

- Disappointment because no specific recommendation for a public access mandate
- Disagreement with the preference that the public access articles be hosted by publishers at their own sites.

Path forward

Among stakeholders

- present and discuss Roundtable's recommendations

US Government

- engagement with HSTC and OSTP on review, and engagement with similar advisory panel for development, implementation and monitoring of policies

Recent development: public access language in HR 5116 (America COMPETES Bill)

- Directs OSTP to establish a “working group” under the NSTC to “*coordinate Federal science agency research and policies related to dissemination and ...stewardship of results of unclassified research including digital data and peer reviewed publications...*”
- “*solicit input from, and collaborate with, non-Federal stakeholders*”
- “*work with international counterparts to maximize interoperability*”
- “*establish priorities ...with respect to benefit to and potential economic impact on science and engineering enterprise and stakeholders...*”
- Note: not a list of specific mandates
- Continues deliberative process with stakeholders begun under roundtable

Acknowledgments

- Roundtable members
- Representative Bart Gordon, Chair, US House Science and Technology Committee (HSTC)
- Dahlia Sokolov (HSTC)
- Diane DiEuliis (OSTP)
- Financial support of Roundtable by AAU and PSP-AAP