Library Open Access Funding on the Ground: Workflows for a Successful OA Transition

Curtis Brundy
cbrundy@iastate.edu
@curtisbrundy

Matthew Goddard
mgoddard@iastate.edu

North Carolina Serials Conference, April 2022
Library-funded OA @ Iowa State

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>409</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OA as a percentage corresponding author output

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OA</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Workflows – what does it take?

• Agreement negotiation
• (Author identification) – a publisher workflow
• Eligibility verification
• Invoicing
• Reporting
• Post-publication workflows
  • Institutional repository deposits
  • OA verification
Agreement negotiation

- Same review process as electronic licensing, but unique clauses
Author Identification

- A publisher responsibility
- What is the net that catches submissions to apply them to the agreement?
- E-mail domain, institutional ID (ROR, Ringgold etc.)
- Broader is better
Eligibility Verification

- “Should this submission be applied to the agreement?”
- Generally, only necessary for capped or APC-based agreements
- Criteria can be flexible, locally defined
- Method: dashboards or e-mail
Invoicing

- Related to structure and size of deal

Reporting

- Assessing value, monitoring spend
- Article-level metadata
Towards standardization and consolidation

- Shared community infrastructure
- Central data exchange hub
- Between research funders, institutions and publishers
- Standardization

- Dashboard for verifications and reporting
- Streamlined payments
- Scalability
Post-Publication Workflows

• Institutional repository deposits
  • Automate via SWORD

• OA verification
Differences that make a difference

- Capped/APC-basis vs. uncapped/flat fee
  - Capped: Wiley, Oxford University Press

- Workflow implications:
  - Capped: importance of eligibility verification, monitoring spend
  - Uncapped: incentive to maximize eligible articles
Differences that make a difference

• Integrated with OA Switchboard / Oable vs. not
  • Integrated: Wiley, Microbiology Society
  • Not: Frontiers, ACM

• Workflow implications:
  • Integrated: managed centrally via Oable, integrated reporting
  • Not integrated: managed separately, manual reporting process
Differences that make a difference

• Is there a “read” component?
  • Yes: Wiley, Microbiology Society
  • No: PLOS, Frontiers

• Workflow implications:
  • Yes: traditional e-resources management required, two sources of value (ROI)
  • No: no/little ERM required, nontraditional source of value (ROI)
Differences that make a difference

• Fully OA journals vs hybrid
  • Fully OA: PLOS, Frontiers
  • Hybrid: Wiley, Oxford

• Workflow implications:
  • Fully OA: higher stakes for authors – APC must be paid
  • Hybrid: lower author stakes, submission experience is key
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