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Our Assumptions

- Current models of OA publishing: not scalable, thus not sustainable

- Scholars prefer to publish in venues most relevant to them and their peers, often those associated with scholarly societies

- Mission of library to support dissemination, collection, organization, and preservation of scholarly output in whatever form

- Sharing products of scholarship is responsibility of every institution

- While not every institution or scholarly society has capacity for publishing enterprise, each has the ability and the responsibility to support those who do
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Our Proposal

1. Create partnerships between libraries and other institutional partners (e.g., long-term archives) and scholarly societies

2. Encourage institutionally supported publishing and preservation for OA publications of all kinds (not just journal articles)

3. Develop a sustainable financial model based on annual or multi-year institutional payments to centrally managed fund established to support infrastructure
Funding Model

- Annual (or multi-year) institutional fees

- Paid by institutions, not libraries

- Low barrier to enable entry for all levels of institutions
Funding Model

$0.50/student/years of study to highest degree awarded

AA = $1 / BA/BS = $2 / MA/MFA/MS = $3 / PhD/MD/JD = $5

+ $5/full-time faculty (Administration, staff, and adjuncts exempt)
# Examples of Institutional Annual Fees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Carnegie Classification</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Full-Time Faculty</th>
<th>Annual Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northwest College</td>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>2,047</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>$2,442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gustavus Adolphus College</td>
<td>Baccalaureate</td>
<td>2,526</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>$6,002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific University</td>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>3,417</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>$11,471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC San Francisco</td>
<td>Medical</td>
<td>3,137</td>
<td>3,237</td>
<td>$31,870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Research</td>
<td>24,725</td>
<td>4,718</td>
<td>$147,215</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All numbers as of 23 August 2013
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MINIMAL CRITERIA FOR SUCCESSFUL APPLICATION
- Positive impact on scholarly communication ecosystem (especially increasing access while decreasing costs)
- Collaboration between at least one academic institution and one scholarly society
- Financial transparency of costs and workflow processes associated with publishing operation
- Archiving and preservation plan
- Clear memorandum of understanding between/among partners

PARTNER APPLICATIONS
- Minimum partnership arrangement: One society or university press + one academic institution (e.g., library)
- Grants: Up to $100,000 per project per annum
- Multiple projects and multiple years may be proposed within a single application
- Projects may be journals, books, multimodal sites, repositories, software, platform development, etc.
- Applications may include costs for project management; peer-review systems and editorial assistance; copyediting and proofreading; metadata creation and remediation; XML markup; software development or licensing; online design and hosting; ingest, migration, storage, and other archiving costs; marketing; administrative overhead
- Print must be print-on-demand with plan for cost recovery
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Roles

Istitution → Scholarly Society → Library

Content Creator/Producer → Content Curator → Content Describer/Archiver
Role of Institutions: Content Creators/Producers

- Support of open-access scholarly endeavors through funding

- Support by presidents on down (i.e., provosts, EVPs, deans, and chairs) of new modes of scholarly communication and criteria for hiring, tenure, promotion

- Guidance for and backing of administration in libraries’ taking on new or expanded roles and responsibilities
Role of Societies: Content Curators

- Editorial services
- Marketing services
- Membership services
- Domain expertise
Role of Libraries: Content Describers/Archivers

- Infrastructure/technology support for society publishing (i.e., production function)

- Focus on/responsibility for preservation (including curation, migration, ongoing access)

- Management of vendor relationships

- Discovery services, metadata enhancements (e.g., SEO)
Examples of Possible Partnerships

Humanities
Examples of Possible Partnerships
Phased Approach

Phase 1 demonstrates proof of concept by converting some HSS society publications to OA.

Phase 2 expands practical implementation of our model to demonstrate it can operate at scale.

Phase 3 (full implementation phase) expands funding and broadens application and review process for proposals to include all comers, from any discipline and from any publisher.
The “Free-Rider” Problem

- Our model focuses on support for cost of producing, sharing, and archiving research and its resulting output — in other words, on creation of a public good

- Research output is “non-rivalrous good”

- Institutions can be incentivized to contribute through such mechanisms as institutional rankings and accreditation criteria
Summary of Key Components

1. While our model funds traditional publications, it is aimed at funding the entire scholarly communication infrastructure, including new modes of communication.

2. We are suggesting putting together societies, institutions, and libraries in collaborative ways that have not been tried before, at least not at scale.

3. The initial focus is on Humanities and Social Sciences where APCs don’t work. APC’s may work for STEM, but sustainability remains a key concern.

4. We're looking to institutions, not just libraries, to fund this model.

5. We want full participation from the entire higher education community. As everyone will benefit, everyone should contribute.
Next Steps

- Revise green paper into white paper, answering readers’ questions and addressing their comments

- Publish white paper

- Begin discussions with possible funders

- Develop model for first (“Phase 0”) partnerships
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