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the goal:

help faculty recognize their stake in the changing landscape of the scholarly communications system and become pro-active in transforming its future
advocacy

organized influence
essentially a rhetorical act
persuading toward action
we are scouts with bugles

they are cavalry

L. BJORKLUND, 1970
our advocacy
their activism
advocates

see a problem

understand consequences

have passion but not power to fix problem

learn options & strategies to fix problem

persuade those with power to become engaged
activists

aware of problem
personal relevance
practical
ethical
sense of urgency
know options & strategies
will to change behaviors
Effective Advocacy

1. Know your audience
2. Focus on the change-makers
3. Know their turf, use their issues
Effective advocacy

I. Know your audience
Old faculty proverb:

The early bird gets the worm but the second mouse gets the cheese
experiential ways of “knowing”

scientists  humanists
researchers  teachers
faculty  administrators

faculty attitudes towards meetings
faculty attitudes towards publishers
faculty attitudes towards librarians
knowledge expert
isolated
a ‘nerd’ to outsiders
driven to extreme specificity
lack capacity for activism
survival favors old nerds’ publishing network

from an essay by Donald Collins, PhD, “The ivory tower and scholar-activism” (May 2006) Academe
Faculty say they publish to ...

- Communicate results to peers
- Advance career
- Personal prestige
- Gain funding
- Financial reward

From Alma Swan “The Culture of Open Access: researchers’ views and responses”
So why aren’t more faculty interested in reforming scholarly publishing?
Swan’s gap between motivation and action:

- lack of awareness
- misconceptions
- disinterest (lack of incentives)
- anxieties
- publisher rights infringements
- time
- difficulty

advocacy opportunities
Faculty Attitudes and Behaviors Regarding Scholarly Communication: Survey Findings from the University of California

August 2007

http://osc.universityofcalifornia.edu/responses/activities.html
Regarding faculty publishing

Concerned with *publication*, not *dissemination*

Conventional behavior in publishing the norm, *but* 21% have published in OA journal & 14% posted in institutional or disciplinary repositories.

Citation and impact factors still key measures of value of scholarship.

*Rely strongly* on existing publishers and believe their personal successes are tied to success of publishers (so are unwilling to rock the boat).

Worry about preserving own publishing outlets.

http://osc.universityofcalifornia.edu/responses/activities.html
Regarding Copyrights

Large majority readily cede copyrights to publishers

75% say not likely to change their practices

7% have modified copyright agreement

4% have refused to agree to terms & forfeited publication in significant journal

http://osc.universityofcalifornia.edu/responses/activities.html
Regarding the SC System

Faculty *are* interested in SC issues
(2/3 aware of OA journals & repositories)

See need for changes but tend not to apply
that awareness to own practices
(gap between attitude and behavior)

General interest in new scholarship/dissemination
models, but low awareness of actual opportunities

Most believe articles will end up online and
accessible to anyone without any effort by author

http://osc.universityofcalifornia.edu/responses/activities.html
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regarding changes to SC system</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strong</strong> belief that tenure and promotion system is barrier to change (constraints felt most strongly by Asst Professors)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of OA: threatens them (cost shift) and/or revenue of societies and publishers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear that SC system changes might undermine quality of scholarship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University mandates (re deposits in IR, e.g.) likely to stir intense debate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

http://osc.universityofcalifornia.edu/responses/activities.html
Regarding educating faculty

Arts & Humanities disciplines may be most fertile for new SC initiatives

Senior faculty may be willing allies and good role models for junior faculty

Faculty prefer direct communication about SC issues from SC office and/or librarians and at departmental meetings

http://osc.universityofcalifornia.edu/responses/activities.html
Effective advocacy

II. Focus on the change-makers
Chemistry

R. Stephen Berry
University of Chicago

"There are some publishers that have been slow to give easy access to their publications on the Internet. This is a suicidal course for publications. Some of them are putting it up on the Internet as a way of losing revenue. People that take that view miss the important point. The value and attraction of a publication depends on it being accessible to readers. Unless it is accessible, they will lose authors, readers and they'll die."

Microbiology

Gary Ward
University of Vermont

"...universal access to the scientific literature levels the playing field for researchers at different institutions and in different parts of the world. To maximize scientific progress, it's critical that everyone has full access rather than be handicapped with barriers to information."

Computer Science

Leslie Pack Kaelbling
Massachusetts Institute of Technology

"It used to be a journal was a journal because of its role of gate-keeping, certifying quality, and its role of dissemination. Now they don't need to be coupled. If dissemination is your goal, just put your research on a Web page. If you want it registered with a date, then you can submit it to an archive. Dissemination is trivial. It's no longer an issue."

History

Ron Rosenzweig
George Mason University

"Scholars like to complain about the quality of information on the Internet, but they should also work actively to ensure that the best of historical writing is available online to the widest possible audience."

Read more of Dr. Kaelbling's views on digital scholarship in computer science.

Read more of Dr. Rosenzweig's views on digital scholarship in history.
Springer - I resign from your Journal

Till today I was a member of the editorial board of Journal of Molecular Modeling, Computational Chemistry, Life Sciences, Advanced Materials, New Methods, published by Springer. It wasn’t very onerous - I occasionally got a mail from the editor to comment on a submitted paper - and I was loyal enough to publish a paper in it two years ago. And I and a co-author were considering publishing another one and because we believe in Open Access wished to do this under the Springer Open Choice system. Here’s what it offers according to its Architect, Jan Velterop (excerpt):

Springer Open Choice: Open Access Publishing
In this model the author also submits a manuscript for peer review, in exactly the same way as in the traditional system. However, when the article is accepted for publication, the author does not transfer copyright, but, instead, arranges for
7 June 2005

I am writing on behalf of the University of California’s Academic Senate and its Special Committee on Scholarly Communication. We want to express our concern about recent ACS actions seeking to constrain the NIH’s PubChem project.

In discussion with colleagues at the University of California and elsewhere we have come to understand that PubChem represents a vital next step for NIH in leveraging its investment in the human genome project by providing data on small molecules. It is a powerful tool that enables medical researchers to harness NIH-funded and other public resources about chemical structures so that they can advance development of new medications. By assuming that publicly financed knowledge is broadly accessible on the Internet in this way, NIH is enhancing the return on public investment in research and stimulating further innovation by public and private scientific enterprises. As you may know, Nobelist Richard Roberts and other renowned chemists and chemical engineers have expressed themselves in detail about these public benefits associated with PubChem (see http://osc.universityofcalifornia.edu/news/acs_pubchem.html#positions).

It is our understanding both from press reports and from your website (http://www.cas.org/ncslib/secemt_statement.pdf) that the American Chemical Society is actively calling for NIH to eliminate or restrict PubChem. ACS claims that PubChem competes with its Chemical Abstracts Service. We appreciate that CAS is a well-used, high-quality database, whose ongoing support depends upon a reasonable business model. However, we are convinced through discussions with and analyses by colleagues that PubChem does not represent an imminent threat to...
Profs Might Make Their Articles Free

Faculty Council proposes 'open access' for journal articles
Published On Thursday, September 27, 2007 3:58 AM
By ALEXANDRA NATT
Crimson Staff Writer

The Faculty Council, the 18-member governing body of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences (FAS), advanced a measure yesterday that would make articles written by Harvard professors in scholarly journals available online at no cost.

The proposal would create a system of 'open access' whereby the authors could make their work available either on a personal or university Web site for free, according to Weary Professor of German and Comparative Literature Judith L. Ryan, who serves on the council.

Professors would have the option to opt out of the new system, Ryan said.

"The problem this is supposed to address is the increasing monopoly that has developed on the part of scholarly journals, who are now making it increasingly difficult for people to access the material they publish," she said.

"Libraries everywhere are paying huge amounts to scholarly journals," she added, "and that means the amount of money they can spend on other purchases is increasingly squeezed."

The program has been spearheaded by Welch Professor of Computer Science Stuart M. Shieber. According to Ryan, Shieber has appeared before the council three times in the past year and a half and has worked closely with the University Office of General Counsel to
Effective advocacy

III. Know their turf, use their issues
Scholarly Communication

THE ISSUES

Costs

Journal price increases are outpacing library budgets and limiting access to research. Find out more about costs...

Copyright

Scholars relinquish control of their own work by signing over intellectual property rights. Find out more about copyright...

New Publishing Models

Dissatisfaction with the existing scholarly communication system has led to the development of new publishing models, including open access and digital repositories. Find out more about new publishing models...
26 Nobel Laureates Support Open Access Mandate at NIH

From Open Access News
Twenty-six US Nobel laureates in science have written an open letter to Congress calling for an OA mandate at the NIH (July 6, 2007). This is actually their second such letter. The first letter (PDF), signed by 25 Nobel laureates, was sent on August 26, 2004.

As scientists and Nobel laureates, we are writing to express our strong support for the House and Senate Appropriations Committees' recent directive to the NIH to enact a mandatory policy that allows public access to published reports of work supported by the agency. We believe that the time is now for Congress to enact this enlightened policy to ensure that the results of research conducted by NIH can be more readily accessed, shared and built upon to maximize the return on our collective investment in science and to further the public good.

As we noted in a letter to Congress urging action on this policy nearly three years ago, we object to barriers that hinder, delay or block the spread of scientific knowledge supported by federal tax dollars including our own works. Thanks to the internet, we can transform the speed and ease with which the results of research can be shared and built upon. However, to our great frustration, the results of NIH-supported medical research continue to be largely inaccessible to taxpayers who have already paid for it.
great content
relevant issues
but whose turf?
their issues
their turf
Georgia Tech Scholarly Communication Summer Program
Departmental Assessment Tool

Department:

Subject Librarian:

**DEPARTMENT PRACTICES AND ATTITUDES**

**Publishing activities**

1. Researchers who are actively publishing in peer-reviewed journals:
   - [ ] Many
   - [ ] Some
   - [ ] Few
   - [ ] None

2. Researchers who peer review or referee:
   - [ ] Many
   - [ ] Some
   - [ ] Few
   - [ ] None

3. Researchers who serve on journal editorial boards:
   - [ ] Many
   - [ ] Some
   - [ ] Few
   - [ ] None

4. List journals where researchers serve on editorial boards. Also list the publishers of these journals.
Select publishers and journals with access-friendly behaviors

Manage copyrights

Self-archive

Try new publication models

Know the OA-friendly granting agencies

researchers/authors

know their turf, use their issues
Lobby for reasonable prices & policies
Work with OA-friendly publishers
Quit unconscionable publishers
Start an open access journal
Consider new publishing partnerships
Instructors

Value increased access for their own class preps

Value increased access for students

Value the kind of access that would allow faculty to model full power of shared knowledge environment

Know their turf, use their issues
Know their turf, use their issues

Members of the faculty

Reach cost/benefit agreement with library re journal acquisition

Mentor junior faculty in best practices re scholarly communications

Revise rewards system (e.g., legitimate alternative publishing venues)

Promote declarations touting OA practices, tough publisher negotiations, IR deposits
Members of learned societies

Know their turf, use their issues

Ask how society journals are funded
Know size & use of profits from publications
Promote OA to journals? full, hybrid, delayed
Balance society activities and society mission to grow and propagate knowledge
Explore potential for disciplinary repository
Taxpayers, citizens, contributors to the ‘common good’

Believe access is a public good

Speak out for taxpayers’ rights to publicly-funded information

Teach power of openly shared information in the world’s knowledge community
Building a Toolkit

Resources for the scholarly communications advocate/activist
copyright management tools for authors
publisher and funder rights policies
tools to find open access journals

http://jinfo.lub.lu.se/info?func=findjournals
examples of new publication models
tool for journal cost/benefit analysis

http://www.journalprices.com

http://www.eigenfactor.org
info on new dissemination models

Reshaping Scholarly Communication

Home > Alternatives for Scholarly Communication

The Facts: Alternatives for Scholarly Communication

New alternatives for the dissemination of research and scholarship are emerging, and they offer new opportunities for scholars to connect with each other and with a larger public. These innovations will allow scholars to share their work more widely and on a more immediate basis, thereby increasing the impact of their research.

See the sections below:

- The Trends
- What You Can Do
- More Information

The Trends

Characteristics of Scholarly Publishing Options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Access</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Peer-reviewed</th>
<th>Responsibility for perpetual access</th>
<th>Business model</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traditional print journals</td>
<td>Restricted</td>
<td>Delayed (usually) — until issue is published</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Libraries</td>
<td>Subscription (i.e., pay to read)</td>
<td>Most commercial and nonprofit publishers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional online journals</td>
<td>Restricted</td>
<td>Delayed (usually) — until issue is published</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Unknown (experiments underway)</td>
<td>Subscription (i.e., pay to read)</td>
<td>Most commercial and nonprofit publishers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open access online journals</td>
<td>Unrestricted</td>
<td>Immediate (usually) — when article is accepted or editing is complete</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Unknown (experiments underway)</td>
<td>Author and/or author's institution (i.e., pay to publish)</td>
<td>BioMed Central, Public Library of Science, Oxford University Press, Springer (only by subscription)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
info on society publications best practices....

The Role of Scholarly Societies

The principal focus of most scholarly societies is to encourage progress of knowledge generally. When societies use their societies to support other scholarly work costs beyond publication, they create barriers to access.

Noting this trend, in December 2005 the University of California Scholarly Societies and Scholarly Communication. In that paper, the society defines best practices:

1. reaffirm that development and dissemination of scholarly purposes of the society;
2. set publication policies to sustain publication and dissemination;
3. acquire only those rights for scholarly work that scholars retain rights which will facilitate other non-
4. work collaboratively with universities and publishers to technologically effective methods of publishing that also include placing work in open access fora; and
5. provide transparency in society and publication finance scholarly communication.

Society Best Practices

The principles above can be put into practice by doing things...
What’s in your toolkit?

For example:

- Suber’s blog/SOAN (SPARC OA Newsletter)
- Anything by Alma Swan (Key Perspectives)
- Create Change Website
- University of California’s Office of Scholarly Communications website
- DOAJ/DOAR/Journal Info
- Sherpa websites (Romeo & Juliet)
Fixate on the big picture

The Scholarly Communications system must change because the current system uses outdated publishing models and is not economically sustainable.

The goal of the movement is increased access; there are many paths to that goal and all can be celebrated.

Librarians are engaging in the work of reform because:
- scholarly communications is our core business
- we are uniquely positioned to advocate, and
- change will benefit both the academy and society as a whole.
Practice what you preach

Seek OA venues for your publications

Manage your copyrights aggressively

Deposit your peer-reviewed articles in SmarTech

Seeks OA friendly changes in your professional associations
Find simplicity in the complexity

Start with the simple goal of fostering conversations with stakeholders/potential activists

Discover, define and tailor conversation starters

Find balance and set realistic limits in developing your personal expertise; tailor your learning to the issues in your liaison areas

Trust that individual areas of expertise will add up to a solid, collective knowledge base across GT library

Consider Alma Swan’s advice: “Stay cheerful!”
3 rules of effective advocacy:

Know your audience
Focus on the change-makers
Know their turf, use their issues
Building your message
Multiple audiences

Faculty
Administrators
VP for Research
Grants Officers
Others?
Multiple issues

Copyright
Self-archiving
New publication models
T&P reform
Funds for publication fees
Support for OA-friendly public policy
Others?
core message  |  tailored message
core message:

“Shouldn’t the way we share research be as advanced as the Internet?”

targeted message:

“[Open sharing of research] changes the way we do science. With data mining and access to more datasets, it’s possible to look at information in different ways. It leverages the original investment. The more eyes looking at the data, the more we will learn.”
Exercise:

1) Craft a targeted message
2) Small group critique and feedback
3) Whole group critique and feedback
Exercise:

1) Craft a targeted message
   “elevator” talk
   about 5 minutes
   simple, clear
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