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Overview

Three main questions today:
• How can a publisher align with library and higher education values through the publisher’s practices?
• How can libraries determine which publishers do this?
• How can libraries determine which publishers are trying to do this?

Answers possibly influence:
• Library resource allocation decisions (not just budgets, but intellectual resources, time investment, etc.)
• Metrics for evaluating publishers
Caveats

• Provisional system

• Has not been vetted

• About journal publishers specifically, not other providers

• It isn’t really about cancellations or BDPs. It’s much broader.

• Not suggesting replacement of metrics, but adding new ones
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Values ➔ Expressed in Practices ➔ Publisher Score
Values + Practices. . . Determine Partners
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Publisher Score = Partnership Scale
Shared Values

• Democratizing Access to Knowledge/Information/Education
  • Higher education
  • Libraries

• Exchange of Information
  • Learned societies
  • Libraries

• Sustainability of Scholarship: Higher Ed., Libraries, Societies
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APCs
Copyright
Author Use
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Business Model
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Discoverability
Publishing Practices

Information Exchange

Institutions of Higher Education

Learned Societies
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Publishing Practices
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Publisher makes articles fully and immediately available to the public in at least 85% of their journals (and they are DOAJ-listed journals or the publisher is an OASPA member)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Publisher auto-archives 100% of articles in a non-profit repository (owned by government or HE institution) within 6 months of publication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Publisher auto-archives 100% of articles in a non-profit repository (owned by government or HE institution) within 12 months of publication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Author-optional archiving of articles to a non-profit repository (owned by government or HE institution) within 12 months of publication for 100% of articles, using either the post-print/author-accepted-manuscript or publisher’s version</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Category: Discoverability (Choose All)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Metadata can be shared following an established schema, such as NLM, RDF, or MODS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Metadata is open access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Articles are published using a permanent identifier, such as a DOI or Handle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Publisher provides rich metadata, improving discoverability and reuse, including descriptive, technical, structural, and administrative (IP) metadata elements <strong>(NOT EVALUATED)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Publisher voluntarily contributes metadata to open initiatives, such as the DOAJ or PMC, even when not funder-required (Note: A journal being listed in the DOAJ does not count as metadata contributions to DOAJ; journals must add article-level metadata to DOAJ to earn points.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Category: Business Practice (Choose All)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The publisher’s website and its online publications meet the latest standard of the Web Content Accessibility Guidelines from the World Wide Web Consortium. <em>(NOT EVALUATED)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The publisher does not allow the same editorial board, with the same review process, to lead multiple journals (such as one hybrid, one open access).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The publisher has not politically lobbied against public access policies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>No boards of journals have left en masse due to disagreements over subscription costs or other terms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The publisher’s agreements with libraries (via journal subscription agreements and/or via the publisher’s licenses of other products) do not include Non-Disclosure Agreements or similar limitations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The publisher permits text and data mining at no cost for scholarly purposes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Public Access ≠ Open Access
Why? OA Archiving Practices

Upper Limit = $2,500
Why? UC’s “Pay It Forward”

Rights, with a Focus on Reuse Rights for Educators
Why? Core Practices/Values, even if Not under a CC License

Discoverability
Publishing Practices
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APCs</td>
<td>Upper Limit = $2,500</td>
<td>Why? UC’s “Pay It Forward”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copyright</td>
<td>Rights, with a Focus on Reuse Rights for Educators</td>
<td>Why? Core Practices/Values, even if Not under a CC License</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author Use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Use</td>
<td>Learned Society &gt; Nonprofit</td>
<td>Why? HE Partner Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Model</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Practices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discoverability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publishing Practices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discoverability

Publishing Practices
Public Access ≠ Open Access

Upper Limit = $2,500

Copyright

Rights, with a Focus on Reuse Rights for Educators

Author Use

Educational Use

Business Model

Learned Society > Nonprofit

Business Practices

No NDAs or Anti-OA Lobbying

Discoverability

Publishing Practices

Why? OA Archiving Practices

Why? UC’s “Pay It Forward”

Why? Core Practices/Values, even if Not under a CC License

Why? HE Partner Activities

Why? Transparency & Trust
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Why?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Access</td>
<td>Public Access ≠ Open Access</td>
<td>OA Archiving Practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APCs</td>
<td>Upper Limit = $2,500</td>
<td>UC’s “Pay It Forward”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copyright</td>
<td>Rights, with a Focus on Reuse Rights for Educators</td>
<td>Core Practices/Values, even if Not under a CC License</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author Use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Use</td>
<td>Learned Society &gt; Nonprofit</td>
<td>HE Partner Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Model</td>
<td>No NDAs or Anti-OA Lobbying</td>
<td>Transparency &amp; Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Practices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discoverability</td>
<td>“Findability,” Preservation, Open Metadata, APCs Waived, Etc.</td>
<td>Information Exchange &amp; Sustainability, even if Not a COPE member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publishing Practices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Publishers Acting as Partners with Public Institutions of Higher Education & Land-grant Universities

A Scoring System to Evaluate Publishers’ Practices through the Values of Higher Education, Libraries, and Learned Societies

Scroll down for:
- Summary
- Scoring Library
- Notes on Additional Criteria
- Examples (Estimated Scores of Four Publishers)

For more information, see the related article published July 2020: https://doi.org/10.3390/publications8030099.

Summary

In this proposed scoring system, tentatively called Publishers Acting as Partners with Public Institutions of Higher Education & Land-grant Universities (PAPPIHELU), partners are publishers that focus on empowering researchers and scholars and also the institutions of higher education (HE) that support them. They see faculty, students, and institutions of HE as essential partners, not customers, and emphasize the rights of content creators and disciplinary experts in the publishing process. Furthermore, publishers are considered partners with HE when they aim to improve public access, transparency, usability, beneficial community impact, and preservation in publishing practices, all of which relate to values shared by institutions of HE, the profession of librarianship, and/or many scholarly societies—values of democratizing access to knowledge, information exchange, and sustainable scholarship. PAPPI criteria evaluate how well a publisher’s practices are in synchronization with the common worldview and ethic of public HE institutions and their libraries.

PAPPI scores are similar to LEED (Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design) certification in architectural and building projects: “Projects pursuing LEED certification earn points for various green building strategies across several categories. Based on the number of points achieved, a project earns one of four LEED rating levels: Certified, Silver, Gold or Platinum.” Additionally, “LEED certification is a globally recognized symbol of sustainability achievement and leadership.”

In brief:

Points are earned by journal publishers. A publisher with a commitment to public access, transparency in business and publishing practices, and respect for the rights of authors as content creators earns more points than one with less open, transparent, and ethical practices.
Democratizing Access

Public Access (0-4)
APCs (0-4)

Copyright (0-3)
Author Use (0-3)
Educational Use (0-3)

Business Model (0-5)
Business Practices (0-23)

Information Exchange

Discoverability (0-13)
Publishing Practices (0-31)
Democratizing Access

Public Access (0-4)
APCs (0-4)

Copyright (0-3)
Author Use (0-3)
Educational Use (0-3)

Business Model (0-5)
Business Practices (0-23)

Information Exchange

Discoverability (0-13)
Publishing Practices (0-31)

Democratizing Access (out of 45)
+ Information Exchange (out of 44)

Publisher Score (out of 89)
PAPPI is Not a Binary, but a Scale

- Important binaries: Committee on Publication Ethics, DOAJ.org

- PAPPI akin to LEED Certification (Certified, Silver, Gold, Platinum)
Principles of Transparency and Best Practice in Scholarly Publishing

Introduction

Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE), the Directory of Open Access Journals (DOAJ), the Open Access Scholarly Publishers Association (OASPA), and the World Association of Medical Editors (WAME) are scholarly organizations that have seen an increase in the number and broad range in the quality of membership applications. Our organizations have collaborated to identify principles of transparency and best practice for scholarly publications and to clarify that these principles form the basis of the criteria by which suitability for membership is assessed by COPE, DOAJ and OASPA, and part of the criteria on which membership applications are evaluated by WAME. Each organization also has its own, additional criteria which are used when evaluating applications. The organizations will not share lists of publishers or journals that failed to demonstrate that they met the criteria for transparency and best practice.

This is the third version of a work in progress (published January 2018); the first version was posted on the COPE website on January 2014 and a second version in June 2015. We encourage its wide dissemination and continue to welcome feedback on the general principles and the specific criteria. Background on the organizations is below.

Principles of Transparency

1. Website: A journal’s website, including the text that it contains, shall demonstrate that care has been taken to ensure high ethical and professional standards. It must not contain information that might mislead readers or authors, including any attempt to mimic another journal/publisher’s site.

An ‘Aims & Scope’ statement should be included on the website and the readership clearly defined. There should be a statement on what a journal will consider for publication including authorship criteria (e.g., not considering multiple submissions, redundant publications) to be included. ISSNs should be clearly displayed (separate for print and electronic).

2. Name of Journal: The journal name shall be unique and not be one that is easily confused with another journal or that might mislead potential authors and readers about the journal’s origin or association with other journals.
How does LEED work

Projects pursuing LEED certification earn points for various green building strategies across several categories based on the number of points achieved, a project earns one of four LEED rating levels: Certified, Silver, Gold or Platinum.

Learn more.

Platinum
80+ points earned

Gold
60-79 points earned

Silver
50-59 points earned

Certified
40-49 points earned

Register a LEED project
Why a Scale?

• Gives space to hundreds of publishers to demonstrate what they do in their own way that supports shared values

• Mistaken to think that the uniformity of practices among 5-6 biggest publishers is also found among the hundreds making up the rest of the research world
Importance of a Numeric Score

• Doesn’t replace Impact Factor but is a missing piece in evaluations
• Easily grasped
• Makes for easy comparisons
• Can demonstrate consistent support for this metric across librarianship/higher ed.—can be used by any institution anywhere, and thus seen as a stable professional metric (not one library acting alone but in concert)
PAPPI Tiers

- PAPPI Tier 1: 62-89 credits (70% of 89 possible credits)
- PAPPI Tier 2: 45-61 credits (at least 51% of possible credits)
- PAPPI Tier 3: 27-44 credits (at least 30% of possible credits)
Scenario #1
Faculty-owned, single journal publisher

Access Score: HIGH

Exchange Score: LOW

32
13
Scenario #1
Faculty-owned, single journal publisher

Potential Library Actions:
PAPPI Tier 2 Publisher

- Consult with publisher about COPE Principles
- Discuss a possible library partnership for:
  - Metadata
  - Preservation
Scenario #2
A big five, profit-driven publisher
Scenario #2

A big five, profit-driven publisher

Potential Library Actions:

PAPPI Tier 3 Publisher

- Negotiate subscriptions
- Negotiate APCs for open access titles
Scenario #3

Learned society, SSPA member publisher

Access Score: HIGH

Exchange Score: HIGH
Scenario #3
Learned society, SSPA member publisher

Potential Library Actions:

PAPPI Tier 1 Publisher

- Pay all APCs, hybrid or not, if <$2,500
- If also low cost per use, trigger a cost-share with institutions
- Meet and discuss further partnerships
### PAPPI Tier 1 Publishers:
- Society for Neuroscience (67)
- eScholarship Publishing (66)

### PAPPI Tier 2:
- Evolutionary Ecology Ltd. (45)
- Elsevier (31)

### PAPPI Tier 3:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Elsevier</th>
<th>eScholarship Publishing (University of California and California Digital Library)</th>
<th>Evolutionary Ecology Limited (Evolutionary Ecology Research)</th>
<th>Society for Neuroscience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Public Access</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. APCs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Copyright</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Author Use</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Educational Use</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Business Model</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Discoverability</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Business Practices</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Other Innovations (not tallied for any title)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Points</strong></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PAPPI Designation**
- Tier 3
- Tier 1
- Tier 2
- Tier 1

[https://doi.org/10.3390/publications8030039](https://doi.org/10.3390/publications8030039)
How Many?

In 2013, publishers **not** in the biggest six published approx. half of all journals/papers.

Larivière, Haustein, & Mongeon, 2015
doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0127502
Society for Neuroscience & SSPA

• High access scores; High exchange scores
• Member of SSPA
  • ~10 SSPA members, all in charge of their own publishing policies/systems
  • All share several core practices, including publisher auto-archiving research articles in PubMed Central after 6 months
  • Similar to some degree to the Society Publishers’ Coalition
• Truly partners with higher ed institutions
  • Public access, not unreasonable APCs, open licenses
  • Significant support for researchers; Faculty-led organization
  • Nonprofit status, small staff
Society Publishers’ Coalition (SocPC)

• “The Society Publishers’ Coalition (SocPC) is a group of likeminded, not-for-profit learned societies, community publishers and charities who publish as part of their charitable objectives and who re-invest the surplus from their publishing into the disciplinary communities they serve.”

• “SocPC members share the common ambition to see an orderly and sustainable transition to open scholarship and to improve the efficiency of the scholarly communication ecosystem for the benefit of researchers and society at large in a fair and sustainable way. In order to help achieve this we wish to work with researchers, funders, institutions and other stakeholders.”
Scientific Society Publisher Alliance

• “SSPA members are concerned that the proliferation of perceived high-impact, for-profit journals—most of which are not rooted in the scientific community—is damaging science by diminishing the influence of active, practicing scientists in determining the trajectories of their disciplines. Our scientist-run, society-owned journals, which continue to be a mainstay of academic publishing, offer authoritative stewardship of the scientific literature, fair treatment of authors, and reinvestment in the scientific enterprise.”

• “The SSPA promotes the principles and practices of our journals, which include peer-editing, publications integrity, transparent community governance, advocacy for science, and our rich history supporting scientists and science in ways beyond publishing.”
Concerns Re: Journal Impact Factor

• Pressure to publish in high IF journals leads to higher number of retracted articles in journals with highest IF. Fang, Steen, & Casadevall, 2012. doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1212247109


• Original purpose of IF was not to judge faculty research but to help librarians determine which journals a library should subscribe to (and was not intended to be a sole metric for that purpose). Garfield, 1996. doi.org/10.1136/bmj.313.7054.411

• Regular manipulation of IF. San Francisco Declaration on Research Assessment, https://sfdora.org/read/
New Metric for Publishers?

PAPPI Tier 1 Publisher

+ COPE member

PAPPI Tier 1 Starred Publisher
New Metric for Publishers?

PAPPI Tier 1 Publisher *(Values-based Practices)*

+ COPE member *(Publisher Best Practices)*

PAPPI Tier 1 Starred Publisher
“The older model of academic publishing practised by learned societies and university presses had prioritized the wide circulation of high-quality scholarship, with little or no expectation of making money [. . .]"
Values-based Metrics & Purpose #2

“The ethos of the academic research community had historically been non-commercial” largely working with entities “such as learned societies and university presses—with a mission for scholarship rather than profit”
Values-based Metrics & Purpose #2

“The ethos of the academic research community had historically been non-commercial”
largely working with entities

“such as learned societies and university presses— with a mission for scholarship rather than profit”

Aileen Fyfe, et al., 2017
doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.546100
Values-based Metrics & Wholism #1

“[Michael] Pollan has encouraged us to leverage consumer power to transform food systems toward health for people and the planet. In the MIT Libraries, we believe that by adopting this vote-with-your dollars approach to spending our collections budget, we will be contributing to transforming the scholarly communication system towards a healthier environment for people and the planet, too.”
Values-based Metrics & Wholism #2

“This will mean, as Pollan suggests, assessing value in a broader, more holistic way than relying primarily on traditional measures like list price versus impact or cost per download. For as Pollan points out, when evaluating cost, we need to incorporate full costs in our assessments. Some foods come cheap but cause health or environmental problems that are not included in the price we pay. In the same way, some pay-walled purchases may seem to offer value in the moment, but may cost us dearly in lost opportunity through artificially limited access, less efficient science and scholarship, and the resulting slower progress working on the greatest problems facing humanity.”
“This will mean, as Pollan suggests, assessing value in a broader, more holistic way than relying primarily on traditional measures like list price versus impact or cost per download. For as Pollan points out, when evaluating cost, we need to incorporate full costs in our assessments. Some foods come cheap but cause health or environmental problems that are not included in the price we pay. In the same way, some pay-walled purchases may seem to offer value in the moment, but may cost us dearly in lost opportunity through artificially limited access, less efficient science and scholarship, and the resulting slower progress working on the greatest problems facing humanity.”

Ellen Finnie, 2016

Internet Archive’s version of In The Open blog post
Values-based Metrics & Sustainability

“The main issues any modernization of the scholarly infrastructure today needs to address are thus comprised by the RAF crisis: Reliability, Affordability and Functionality.”

Reliability = Replicability
Affordability
Functionality = Interoperability
Values-based Metrics & Sustainability

“The main issues any modernization of the scholarly infrastructure today needs to address are thus comprised by the RAF crisis: Reliability, Affordability and Functionality.”

Reliability = Replicability
Affordability
Functionality = Interoperability

Bjorn Brembs, 2019

http://bjoern.brembs.net/2019/10/scholarship-has-bigger-fish-to-fry-than-access/
Values-based Metrics & Innovation

PLOS + UC
PLOS + Iowa State
PLOS + Carnegie Mellon
PLOS + Jisc/U.K. Universities

Flat Fees. Supporter Fees.
No/Reduced APCs. No Subscriptions. Fully OA.

How do we decide which innovations to support/try?
Values-based metrics can help us evaluate publishers. They can simultaneously help us identify partners.
Not Just Journal Publishers

• Values-based metrics could be used to evaluate any type of provider, in libraries or out.

• Sustainability, knowledge exchange, and democratization of knowledge are institutional values. They are researcher values, too. Our decisions and investments should reflect those values.
Other Ways Forward?

• Again, this is provisional. What’s missing? What could be improved?

• What other metrics can we develop? What other steps can we take to address issues related to resource allocation decisions in libraries and higher education?

• I welcome your thoughts:
  • rachelcaldwell@utk.edu
  • @TheLibIsOpen