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On the folly of rewarding A, while hoping for B

The Commitment:

Every academic library should commit to contribute 2.5% of its total budget to support the common infrastructure needed to create the open scholarly commons.

See: David W. Lewis, “The 2.5% Commitment,”
https://scholarworks.iupui.edu/handle/1805/14063
Why 2.5%?

2.5% of $7 billion (annual U.S. academic library expenditures) = $175 million

60% of $175 million = $105 million

The *Financial Times* reported that Elsevier paid $115 million to acquire Bepress


David Bond, “Relx Buys Bepress to Boost Academic Publishing,” *Financial Times*, August 2, 2017, [https://www.ft.com/content/c6f6c594-7787-11e7-a3e8-60495fe6ca71](https://www.ft.com/content/c6f6c594-7787-11e7-a3e8-60495fe6ca71)
Why 2.5%?

As a community, academic libraries have a collective action problem.
“Although it is likely that university libraries could develop a more efficient system of scholarly communication if they were to redeploy their collective subscription budgets, each individual library—when it decides how to spend its own little piece of that huge pie—has little incentive to redirect its own expenditures… Unfortunately, if every librarian waits for every other librarian to make the investments necessary to develop a sustainable system of Gold OA publishing, it may never happen.”

— John Wenzler

Why 2.5%?

An attempt to develop community norms around the level of contribution to the collective good.

And about what organizations and projects deserve support.
Links to slides, sign up for mailing list, comment forms, and more at:

http://scholarlycommons.net/cni2017

On twitter @in4open
Opening Questions

1. What should we count as an Open Investment?

2. How much do libraries spend on Open annually?

3. How might we understand these investments in the broader context of overall library spending?
Step One:
Make a list of what counts as an open investment
The List

- 120 crowdsourced items
- 60 ‘other’ items added by participants
- 105 items had some level investment
- Biggest investment: $1,137,026 for staffing for IR staffing (23 schools)
- Smallest investment: $20 for Zotero

The list lives at scholarlycommons.net
Step Two: Recruit schools to participate
- Asked Sparc, Leading Change, Oberlin Group, OSI, various other library consortia, colleagues, and via our website
- 60 signed up
- 35 filled out the form
Demographics

- Smallest: FTE of 1,394
- Largest: FTE of 53,000
- Master's Colleges & Universities: Larger Programs: 3
- Doctoral Universities: Higher Research Activity: 15
- Baccalaureate Colleges: Arts & Sciences Focus: 14
- Other (Canada): 3
Step Three: Analyze initial data
Analysis of the 35 Entries

○ Average Total Budget (w/o salaries) : $7,633,990
○ Most invested: $868,065
○ Least investment: $1,048
○ Investment per FTE
  ■ Most $112
  ■ Least : $1
  ■ Average: $23
Analysis

- Average percent of library budget:
  - Of total budget (w/o staff): 2.96%
  - Of collections: 4.12%
- Biggest investor: 9.4%
- Smallest investor: 0.3%
## Top Ten Investments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>item</th>
<th>amount</th>
<th>number</th>
<th>amount/investor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IR Staffing</td>
<td>$1,137,026</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>$49,436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funds to support article processing fees . in Gold OA</td>
<td>$599,754</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>$39,984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>publications</td>
<td>$519,902</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>$47,264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open access journal publishing - staff costs</td>
<td>$438,056</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$146,019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Preservation Trust <a href="http://aptrust.org/">http://aptrust.org/</a></td>
<td>$358,440</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>$23,896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IR Software</td>
<td>$309,330</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>$19,333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HathiTrust <a href="https://www.hathitrust.org/">https://www.hathitrust.org/</a></td>
<td>$305,425</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$152,713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Knowledge Project <a href="https://pkp.sfu.ca/">https://pkp.sfu.ca/</a></td>
<td>$179,296</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>$8,965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge Unlatched</td>
<td>$167,216</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$8,801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.knowledgeunlatched.org/">http://www.knowledgeunlatched.org/</a></td>
<td>$161,975</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$17,997</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Full list at [https://scholarlycommons.net/the-list/](https://scholarlycommons.net/the-list/)
# Measuring our Open Investments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of institutions reporting</th>
<th>35</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>totals</th>
<th>averages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Library Budget (excluding salaries)</td>
<td>$267,189,647</td>
<td>$7,633,990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Collections Budget</td>
<td>$191,575,977</td>
<td>$5,473,599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total FTE</td>
<td>555,651</td>
<td>16,343</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Investments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Investments</th>
<th>totals</th>
<th>averages</th>
<th>Percent of Investment in that Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Common Core Non-Profit Infrastructure</td>
<td>$1,743,584</td>
<td>$49,817</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Content</td>
<td>$3,387,066</td>
<td>$96,773</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Repositories</td>
<td>$1,879,171</td>
<td>$53,691</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizations</td>
<td>$890,205</td>
<td>$25,434</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$7,900,026</td>
<td>$225,715</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- % of total budget invested in open: 2.96%
- % of collections budget invested in open: 4.12%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Investment per FTE</th>
<th>$14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of investments</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Feedback from participants

More comments available at scholarlycommons.net
1. How much did you know about your library’s Open contributions before you undertook this exercise?
2. What about the results was expected? What surprised you?
3. Is your library considering changing its level of contribution to Open or where they are made as a result of this exercise?
4. What recommendations would you make to advance the project as it is developed further?
Advice on strategy
Increase the target to 5%. Think about facilitating conversations among participants and in the broader community about collective efforts that would tip the scales in the open / market balancing act.
What is the vision, how do we get there, who decides? How do we move quickly and with unified determination, and yet slowly enough to consult together, deliberate carefully, and design wisely?
Questions about what should be counted
Should we focus primarily on infrastructure (i.e. software, technology, etc.) and not include open content?
Within infrastructure, should we focus on initiatives that are widely adopted and have an international community, versus more geographically, regionally, or nationally constrained initiatives? By extension, should new/emerging initiatives be included and if so, how?
More detail should be provided on eligible in-kind contributions, e.g. staff time/costs at the local institution and how to calculate this.
Local Plans
We are always looking at ways to effectively support a transition to open access; currently thinking about how to develop a more comprehensive strategy to increase and coordinate our efforts.
Concerns
Expanding the definition of shared OA infrastructure may have the effect of making institutions feel good about themselves, but it is counterproductive. What is really needed is a comprehensive vision, not a disparate list of activities.
As the word of the year was just announced as "complicit" there is much to be said about where the other 97.5% of library budgets go, and if that aligns with long term values.
The exercise made it clear that individual library efforts have limited impact.
Statements of Support
We might need to use a higher percentage target in the name of the initiative!!
I would encourage everyone to figure out what you are already spending.
Well, if you could drive a certain commercial publisher out of business, that would be icing on the cake. :)

What Comes Next?

1. A standard easy to use web based tool for calculating contribution
2. The standard contribution % becomes part of reported statistics (ARL, ARCL, etc.)
3. “Portfolios” for investment developed
4. United Way like organization to channel funds and evaluate investments
What Comes Next?

1. Angie’s List for open infrastructure projects — increase knowledge and transparency
2. Connect to other efforts to create an ‘open index’ that will document progress and growth
Questions/Comments

Mike Roy mdroy@middlebury.edu
David W. Lewis dlewis@iupui.edu
Diane Graves dgraves@trinity.edu
Lori Goetsch lgoetsch@ksu.edu

http://scholarlycommons.net  @in4open
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Questions

1. What should and should not count?
2. In particular, how should we think about for-profit companies?
3. How inclusive should we be in considering open initiatives beyond open access?
4. With whom and how do we connect this to other efforts to avoid it being duplicative and/or counter-productive?