

OPEN ACCESS AND CANADIAN UNIVERSITY PRESSES:

A White Paper

Prepared for the Association of Canadian University Presses by

Andrea Kwan

The Association of Canadian University Presses gratefully acknowledges the Department of Canadian Heritage for its support of this project through the Canada Book Fund.

Canada

OPEN ACCESS AND CANADIAN UNIVERSITY PRESSES: A White Paper

Contents

Executive Summary	3
Introduction	5
I. History and Current State of Affairs	7
- The Green and Gold Roads to Open Access	9
- Journals and Monographs	14
- The Ithaka Report	16
II. Open Access in the International Context	19
- Open Access in the United States	20
- Open Access in Europe	25
III. Open Access in Canada	31
- Case Study: Athabasca University Press	38
- Open Access and Other Canadian Presses	42
IV. Possible Business Models and Future Considerations	44
1. Author-Pays Model	44
2. Institutional Subsidies Model	45
3. Third-Party Funding Model	46
4. Freemium Model	47
5. Three-Party Market Model	47
6. Hybrid Model	48
7. Embargo Model	49
8. Advertising Model	50
9. Collaborative Model	50
10. SCOAP ³ Model	51
11. Complete Restructuring	52
12. Do Nothing	53
- Looking Towards the Future	54
V. Conclusion	56
Bibliography	61

OPEN ACCESS AND CANADIAN UNIVERSITY PRESSES: A White Paper

Executive Summary

In the past few years, the debate surrounding open access (OA) – the idea that academic research, particularly that funded by taxpayer dollars, should be freely accessible to whoever desires to read it – has become widespread, occupying agendas at many levels of academic practice and governance, from individual scholars to university libraries and administrations, to scholarly societies, and, in some cases, to national and multinational governments. In most cases, the discussion has not been about the accessibility goals of OA but rather about how and if OA can be made economically sustainable. Canadian university and scholarly presses, as key players in scholarly communication both in Canada and abroad, have a vested interest in how this debate plays out. This report represents the beginning of our attempt to clarify and consider the myriad implications of open access for the future of our industry.

While open access has been an issue in some disciplines for many years, momentum behind it has grown substantially since the Budapest Open Access Initiative was signed by representatives from several countries, including Canada, in 2002. That initiative identified two main routes for achieving open access: self-archiving (the “green road to open access”) and open access journals (the “golden road to open access”). Self-archiving relies on individual scholars depositing copies of their research into open archives, administered by university libraries or other institutions, while open access journals entail offering research for free via peer-reviewed web-only publications. While the golden road does not specifically refer to monograph publishing, proponents of OA do not exclude monograph-length research from their aims.

As a new model, OA presents some significant challenges to traditional scholarly publishing. For one, the high standards of peer review for which university presses are known must be upheld at a fraction of current costs. Furthermore, the traditional copyright that has governed publishing for decades and that forms the basis of most publisher contracts has been modified to accommodate OA, in a way that, while protecting the author's interests, does not safeguard the publisher's contribution to the scholarship. Producing quality scholarly research in a readable form is a time-consuming and exacting process that costs money. Even when printing and distribution costs are not factored in, the average scholarly monograph can cost anywhere from \$7000 to \$34,000 to produce. Thus, the sustainability of an open-access-based business model is a key concern for scholarly publishers who are considering offering OA products.

Western countries have dealt with these issues in a number of different ways. In the US, where much of the initial push for OA originated, open access has been funded by volunteer academics and grants from foundations, universities, and government. Major government granting agencies, as well as some universities, including Harvard, have mandated open access initiative. Some US university presses have undertaken initiatives in OA publishing by offering books for free in PDF form on their website while still selling print copies of the books to those who prefer paper to

pixels. In Europe, OA is now mandated for most research funded by the European Commission. Several European university presses offer OA versions of their books and journals. At least one commercial press, Bloomsbury Academic, has begun to offer open access to its books.

Canadian presses have been watching the OA movement with great interest but few have direct experience offering OA titles. Athabasca University Press, Canada's newest scholarly press, is the only Canadian scholarly publisher to operate as entirely OA, using a business model that continues to publish its titles in print while offering a PDF version for free on its website. Presses that have experimented with OA have not reported any effect, negative or positive, on sales of printed books that have also been offered in an OA format.

The goal of open access – to eliminate access barriers to scholarly research – is not contentious for university presses, but how to achieve OA remains a major stumbling block. Many different business models might be employed by publishers, from continuing on with business as usual, to employing a hybrid print-OA model like that used by Athabasca UP, to completely restructuring the industry in a way that will implicate not only university presses but also the scholars, libraries, universities, and funders to whom they are connected. This paper addresses eleven such models in the hopes that some might be of use to individual presses, and to the industry as a whole, when considering how best to approach the challenges inherent in OA publishing.

This paper does not pretend to have solutions to the dilemma of open access. Rather, it attempts to lay out the steps that have brought us to the point at which we now find ourselves, highlight some of the major issues associated with switching to an OA model, and offer some ideas on how university presses might respond to those issues. We anticipate that much more discussion will take place among all players in scholarly communication; it is our hope that this paper will offer a common starting point for this discussion and serve as a jumping-off point for further research and debate.

Introduction

This report originates from a widespread desire among Canadian university presses to address calls for open access (OA) from both within Canadian academia and from the broader international scholarly community, to which the membership of the Association of Canadian University Presses (ACUP) proudly belongs.

One of the main principles behind the open access movement, making the product of academic research widely available to other scholars, as well as the general public, has, in many ways, always been the *raison d'être* of university presses. We have historically been committed to the publication of specialized works for which the market is too small or financially unviable to attract the interest of for-profit publishers. Over the years, we've developed our own specializations in identifying groundbreaking scholarship, editing and facilitating objective peer review of academic works, working with academic and public libraries, helping professors select appropriate books for courses, and publicizing important research to the media, general public, and special interest groups. Indeed, the quality control we have brought to scholarly communication has become a key part of academic life: in many disciplines, particularly in the humanities and social sciences, publication with a reputable university press is a prerequisite for tenure and for faculty member promotion.

The unprecedented accessibility offered by the internet has unquestionably shifted the ground upon which most of our business models have traditionally been built. The web has presented a putative paperless economy in which a universe of information is freely available to anyone with a computer and an internet connection. However, as discerning internet users are aware, *caveat emptor* applies to all that free information. The promise of the internet – an unlimited store of information to which we all have access – comes with an unspoken disclaimer: the quality of that information varies enormously, and sorting the wheat from the chaff remains the responsibility of each individual user.

The present challenge for university presses, then, is to discover how to take advantage of the economy of the internet – both in terms of the heightened capacity for information dissemination and the savings in print and distribution costs – while still maintaining the rigorous quality control standards that we are known for within the academic community. And, more importantly, to safeguard our financial sustainability such that we can continue to perform our vital roles in the academia well into the future.

This paper investigates a number of issues related to the economic sustainability of Canadian university presses with respect to open access. The first section examines the history and current state of affairs of the OA movement in Canada, the United States, and Europe. An explanatory note is necessary here: this report addresses OA as it relates to journal publishing with an eye to how such developments relate to book publishing in the digital environment, as the bulk of the publishing undertaken by our members comprises monographs and collections, rather than journals. Many excellent websites and publications already exist that compile and summarize OA

in a journal context. These, along with publications of specific interest to monograph publishers, are listed in the bibliography. The second section of this report looks specifically at how open access applies, and might apply, to academic book publishing. Here, the report summarizes the current situation for ACUP members and takes a brief look at how our situation compares to that of our fellow presses in the United States and Europe. To the degree that information was made available to us, we consider both funders' and key stakeholders' intent with respect to OA, both in the present and in the foreseeable future. The section concludes with brief case studies of Canadian and international open access monograph initiatives. The final section presents possible business models and addresses future considerations for Canadian university presses. Because the goal of this report is not to prescribe any one course of action for all presses, a number of possible scenarios and theoretical concerns are presented. Ultimately this paper is intended to provide a meaningful starting point for future discussion and business planning, such that our membership may approach the important challenge of open access in as knowledgeable a fashion as possible, and such that each press may have the flexibility to address its own unique concerns as it sees fit.¹

We sincerely hope that this report will lay the groundwork for further discussion and action with respect to open access. Detractors of Canadian university presses have accused us of being stalwartly opposed – even hostile – to the concept of OA. Nothing could be further from the truth: we are and always have been strongly committed to the wide dissemination of academic research, the principle that underpins the open access movement. However, we cannot afford to rush headlong into free delivery of content, content that costs a significant amount of time and money to produce, and still maintain the quality standards that we are committed to upholding in the scholarly community. Our goal is to find a way to maximize the benefits made available to us by the internet to further the aims of OA, while maintaining financial stability that enables us to produce the quality publications that our community of academics, librarians, students, and general readers have come to rely on. This report represents our first step on that path.

I. History and Current State of Affairs

Highlights

- Open access becomes a going concern in the publishing industry as a result of the sharp decline in library spending on scholarly monographs brought on by the rapidly increasing costs of scientific, technological, and medical (STM) journals.
- The Budapest Open Access Initiative (BOAI) is signed in 2002 by representatives from several countries. It calls on scholars, universities, and publishers to make academic research freely available to the public via the internet in order to further the aims of primarily scientific research without financial barriers to access.

In the mid- to late-1990s, the scholarly publishing industry – publishers, librarians, wholesalers, and academics themselves – found themselves caught up in the maelstrom that became known as the “serials crisis.” During this time, the cost to libraries of journals, mostly scientific, technical, and medical, rose astronomically as large multinational firms demanded – and received – unprecedented sums for subscriptions to some of the world’s most reputable journals in these fields. As more and more journals were acquired by the multinationals, practices such as bundling, where libraries are charged a subscription cost for a collection of journals, many of which they don’t require, for a reduced price on each individual journals, began to emerge. Library budgets became severely stretched. As a result, libraries allocated less money to monographs and journals in the social sciences and humanities and began to expand the practice of consortium buying, which allowed several libraries to share a common set of resources through interlibrary loan. Not surprisingly, by the early 2000s, many libraries, not to mention publishers of smaller journals and monographs, began to find this system to be financially unsustainable. Pressure was building to find a new, more feasible system to govern library acquisition and management of scholarly output.²

December 2001 marked a turning point: the Open Society Institute (OSI) convened a meeting in Budapest to discuss how to further free access to scholarly research articles in all disciplines. Citing “the unprecedented public good” that would come from unrestricted access afforded by the internet and the willingness of scientists and scholars to share the results of their research without expectation of remuneration, the OSI called upon “all interested institutions and individuals to help open up access ... and remove the barriers, especially the price barriers, that stand in the way” of “free and unrestricted online availability” of scholarly literature.³ The Budapest Open Access Initiative (BOAI), officially signed in February 2002, was primarily concerned with access to peer-reviewed journal articles but also considered unreviewed preprints scholars and scientists might wish to share online for the purposes of generating discussion or to alert the academic world of important research. In many ways a response to the widespread commodification of knowledge by the large multinational journal publishers, open access was defined as:

the free availability [of scholarly literature] on the public internet, permitting any users to read, download, copy, distribute, print, search, or link to the full texts of these articles, crawl for indexing, pass them as data to software, or use them for any other lawful purpose, without financial, legal, or technical barriers other than those inseparable from gaining access to the internet itself. The only constraint on reproduction and distribution, and the only role for copyright in this domain, should be to give authors control over the integrity of their work and the right to be properly acknowledged and cited.⁴

The Green and Gold Roads to Open Access

Highlights

- Two means of achieving the goals of the BOAI are proposed: the “green road” entails the voluntary use of open archives as repositories for both peer-reviewed and non-peer-reviewed scholarship; the “golden road” is free access to peer-reviewed journal and monograph publications.
- Both the green and golden roads to OA fail to account for some of the chief mechanisms that fund and enable current scholarly publishing models, namely copyright, pricing, dissemination, and peer review. Each mechanism would need to be addressed in any decision by a scholarly monograph publisher to move to open access.

The signatories to the BOAI further envisaged two main ways to achieve their goals: self-archiving, which later became known as the “green road to open access,” and open-access journals, “the golden road to open access.”⁵ The former strategy, self-archiving, requires individual scholars to deposit their journal articles and preprints into open electronic archives. The latter, perhaps more controversial, strategy, open-access journals, involves user-fee-free access to peer-reviewed, copyright-free research. In lieu of traditional subscription or access fees, these journals should be funded by alternative means, including through research foundations, governments, universities, or endowments; profits from ancillary add-ons to the original scholarship; funds made available for switching from subscription-based journals to OA journals; and contributions from the researchers themselves.

It immediately became obvious that both roads to OA, as laid out by the Budapest proposal, demanded a complete overhaul of the business models that had been driving scholarly publishing, in particular, scholarly journal publishing – for decades. Successful implementation of the BOAI requires that many of the mechanisms of scholarly publishing, long considered givens, be radically revised or thrown out completely. Chief among these are copyright, pricing, dissemination, and peer review.

Copyright

Traditionally, copyright for scholarly material, once accepted for publication, is held by the publisher. The publisher then distributes the document for sale and licenses any use of the document outside of that designated as personal use (for example, for inclusion in course packages, reprints in textbooks or collections, adaptation into instructional or entertainment video, and so on). The BOAI, with its call to allow users to “read, download, copy, distribute, print, search, or link to the full texts of these articles, crawl them for indexing, pass them as data to software, or use them for any other lawful purpose, without financial, legal, or technical barriers,” necessitates a shift in the way copyright has been licensed within the scholarly publishing industry. Open access advocates advise authors and/or publishers to take out a Creative Commons licence for their work. Under a Creative Commons licence, authors retain the copyright to their material and choose the conditions under which their work may be legally used,

copied, shared, displayed, distributed, and performed, and how it should be credited. These licences, which are available in four different levels varying from completely open to redistribution only, may be obtained for free at creativecommons.org. The goal of the licences aligns perfectly with the aims of OA: “making it easier for people to share and build upon the work of others, consistent with the rules of copyright.”⁶

From the perspective of traditional publishers, however, the Creative Commons licence deviates significantly from the copyright arrangements upon which many contracts have been based. Reprint rights, for example, have long been a source of income for publishers. While not a main source of income, such rights have nevertheless generated funds that have been used to subsidize the ongoing operations of the publisher. A shift to Creative Commons licences, as recommended by OA advocates, thus entails the loss of this income to the publisher, which must then be recouped in some other way.

Pricing

Delivering scholarly information via the parameters laid out in the BOAI – that is, “without financial barriers” – requires completely rethinking the business of publishing. The writers of the Budapest initiative acknowledge that even though the ultimate goal of OA is to provide peer-reviewed journal literature online free to readers, “it is not costless to produce.” Publishers wishing to embrace OA must find a way, then, to cover the significant costs of editorial development and production that eschews the traditional consumer-pays model that has long governed commercial publishing and, indeed, most other for-profit and not-for-profit industries.

The BOAI suggests that scholarly publishers look for other sources of funding, such as grants from host universities, foundations, and endowments, or change the model from user-pays to author-pays. Some for-profit scholarly journals have begun to experiment with the latter scenario, offering the open access option to journal contributors. While the schemes differ from publisher to publisher, the cost-per-article to authors for optional open access ranges from US\$665 for the least expensive (non-foundation-funded) journal at BioMed Central to US\$3250 at Taylor and Francis. Oxford Open, a non-profit enterprise, charges US\$3000 for the open access option (discounted to US\$2250 for authors whose institutions have a full-price subscription to the journal in question). Only Oxford Open mentions a sliding scale for offering open access to developing countries. All publishers, with the exception of BioMed Central (owned by Springer, but founded as a strictly OA enterprise), restrict which journals offer an OA option.⁷ Additionally, all publishers make concessions for research funded by the National Institutes of Health (NIH). In such cases, a twelve-month embargo on the OA version of the article was levied, unless the author had taken advantage of the author-pays model, where available.

How successful these author-pays models are for journal publishers still remains to be seen. Richardson reports that in 2006, Oxford Open found that 11% of authors in its OA-optional life-sciences journals took advantage of the scheme, while only 5% of authors in medical journals and a mere 2% of those in the social sciences and humanities opted for author-pays OA.⁸ The argument can be made that such shifting of fees is little more than a shell game that transfers the

burden of cost from the user to the author. In many cases, authors use publication subsidies from their institutions to pay OA author fees, which, in the broader picture, may simply result in a re-allocation of institutional funds from library subscription budgets to research budgets in order to cover the costs of access to research. Finding a sustainable model for offering open access to scholarship must entail more than a simple switching of pockets from which money is taken. Moreover, while the cost to produce a single peer-reviewed journal article may be at least superficially viable for an individual author to subsume, the cost of production of a peer-reviewed scholarly monograph, at five to ten times the length of a journal article, is unquestionably prohibitive for individual authors. Currently, none of the large journal publishers that also produce book-length works offer an OA monograph option.

Dissemination

The issue of dissemination differs notably for journal and monograph publishers. Today, most, if not all, journals are available online, regardless of whether or not they are subscription-based or open access. Indeed, some journals (for example, all journals published by BioMed Central) offer only online versions, thereby foregoing the constraints and costs of print formats. Thus, offering OA to journals is often more a question of digital rights management (DRM) than of the medium itself. In the case of scholarly book publishing, however, the printed version of the work is still very much the central product. Certainly, the e-book has been around for well over a decade, and publishers have produced and distributed them, mostly to libraries, with varying degrees of success. The distribution of e-books has been mediated by a number of different middlemen, such as NetLibrary, Ebrary, mylibrary, The Ebooks Corporation, and Questia, each of whom have slightly different file preparation standards so the books can be read on their proprietary platforms. User-licences that accompany the e-books vary from single-user time-limited to multi-user perpetual; the cost of the e-book to libraries usually varies accordingly. While the library market for e-books has certainly increased over the last decade, this revenue stream is still far outstripped by the revenue generated by the sale of traditional print books. Because print production involves a “sunk investment” and the market for a print edition is put at risk of cannibalization by a digital edition, in the current unsettled climate, many publishers protect their proven traditional revenue stream (the sale of print titles to libraries) by delaying the release of e-book editions until six to eighteen months following the first print publication date.

Some of the delay in the broad adoption of e-books has been due to the lack of a uniform distribution platform. Differing file specifications across e-book distributors and aggregators introduce a level of technological complexity to which many academic monograph publishers are ill-equipped to respond. The low demand for the e-book product has so far failed to provide sufficient incentive for publishers to expand this section of their product base, though some publishers have embarked upon projects to digitize some, if not all, of their backlists. Finally, that individual scholars and students continue to prefer the printed product to its electronic counterpart has meant that publishers must continue to produce printed books in sufficient volume to meet this demand, thereby negating any real savings that might be available in an e-book only market. It is only recently, as the public, both general and academic, begins to accept e-book readers such as the Amazon Kindle and the Sony Reader, and other mobile reading devices such as iPods and

netbooks, that the e-book has begun to appear to be a viable primary product. But traditional book publishers will likely be caught between the world of the codex and the e-book for the foreseeable future. The question for such publishers in the coming days is thus (at least) twofold: how do they value e-books relative to their printed counterparts in a way that maintains financial stability and, within this context, how can they facilitate open access to their product without cannibalizing the e-book market that promises, eventually, to replace or overtake their current primary product, the printed monograph?

Peer Review

A key function of both journal and monograph publishers is peer review. A safeguard against the publication of subpar, erroneous, or methodologically flawed scholarship, peer review is a well-established, rigorous process. In brief, it involves the selection of unbiased reviewers who, for a small honorarium and as part of their traditional academic responsibilities, agree to evaluate the suitability of a manuscript for publication. These anonymous reviewers are solicited by acquisitions editors – scholarly editors who frequently specialize in particular fields of study and who are responsible for developing and maintaining contacts within those fields for the purposes of both peer review and connecting with prospective authors. While the golden road to open access as envisaged by the BOAI retains the peer review function of academic presses, at least with respect to journals, the green, or self-archiving, option fails to guarantee it and leaves peer review up to either individual authors or to the gatekeepers of the open archives in which the BOAI recommends that the articles be deposited. Significantly, the Open Archives Initiative (www.openarchives.org), to which the BOAI refers, focuses on the technological aspects of data harvesting, search engine operability, and resource sharing and does not specify any guidelines whatsoever for monitoring or ensuring the quality of the data contained in these archives.

To many,⁹ self-archiving is generally seen as both economically and ideologically preferable to open access journals. However, wholesale adoption of this model without uniform standards of unbiased evaluation jeopardizes the objective peer review process facilitated by university presses in both the journal and monograph worlds. Indeed, scholars, librarians, and tenure committees have long taken the imprint of recognized scholarly publishers as an indicator of the quality of the scholarship in question.

The premise of self-archiving is that authors would deposit their works, royalty- and copyright-free, into a suitable open archive. Open archives fall into two main categories: institutional repositories (IRs) and subject-based repositories. The former house research emanating from a specific institution (such as a university or government organization), while the latter amalgamate work based on the field of study. The problem with both of these models is that neither necessarily requires that the articles deposited be peer reviewed. The solution proposed to this problem, at least by the earliest and most eminent subject-based archive, arXiv.org (physics), is to accept articles as “pre-prints” with the assumption that many of these articles will later be submitted and accepted – and in the process, peer reviewed – by journals in the discipline. Pre-prints that are deposited in the archive are later annotated with the information that the article was

accepted by a peer-reviewed journal.¹⁰ In this case, the OA self-archiving scenario does not replace the peer-review process, but rather supplements it. Moreover, it shifts the burden of quality assessment from the information provider (in this case, the archive) to the user: the responsibility of ensuring that the source is reliable falls on the individual researcher, who must check that the works that s/he uses have been accepted by a journal and hence peer reviewed. The self-archive, then, basically fulfills a search-engine role within a discipline-specific domain.

The main concerns with respect to peer review for monograph publishers striving to attain OA pertain to economic viability and sustainability. Acquisitions editors are professionals who work closely with authors to ensure that the scholarship produced is of the highest possible quality. A key part of their job is to facilitate a thorough and unbiased peer review. Unlike academics, who will often take on the editorship of a journal because they “believe in the intellectual mission of the journal and expect to be paid indirectly by the satisfaction they experience from aiding the research of others, from furthering quality research, and from any prestige that their position offers,”¹¹ acquisitions editors do not volunteer their services. Even if it would be possible or desirable to farm out the management of peer review to unremunerated academic editors, the peer review process for a monograph manuscript is much more involved than it is for journals. An average monograph, for example, generally runs from 200 to 400 pages in length and puts forth a sustained argument that must be thoroughly evaluated, not only for its main idea(s), but also for supporting evidence and readability. The reviewing process itself is highly labour intensive, and finding reviewers willing to take on such projects can be both difficult and time-consuming. Moreover, these editors remain connected to their projects throughout the book production period – a process that can sometimes take up to two years. This ongoing attention is vital, not only to the end quality of the published research, but also to the researchers themselves. Many first-time authors have found immeasurable support in the editor-author relationship. The process is of particularly great importance for young scholars in the early stages of their careers. Sustaining this process under the auspices of volunteer editors is a risky proposition for even the most optimistic of publishers. Thus, either the expense of peer review or the challenges of sustaining a publishing program on the shoulders of unpaid editors must be accounted for in any OA model adopted by a scholarly monograph publisher.¹²

Journals and Monographs

Highlights

- Aside from manuscript length and best method of dissemination, scholarly journals and monographs also differ from each other in terms of the amount of competition within their markets and their funding and revenue streams.
- Large journal publishers have not been affected by declining library sales and the increased competition in their core markets while scholarly monograph publishers have faced considerable challenges in these areas in recent years.
- Journals derive the bulk of their revenues from subscription sales and advertising whereas Canadian monograph publishers, in particular, rely heavily on sales to libraries, individual scholars, and course adoptions, as well as government grants, to remain solvent.

The bulk of scholarship, buzz, and discussion surrounding OA in the academic world has focused on journals rather than on monographs, and then largely on scientific, technical, and medical (STM) journals rather than those in the humanities and social sciences (HSS). As a result, much of the information available and many of the scenarios proposed do not necessarily apply to HSS scholarly monographs. Some of the chief differences between journals and monographs – manuscript length and method of dissemination – have already been noted above, but there are others that will have affect how open access is likely to differentially affect monographs.

Competitive Market

The primary market for both journals and monographs is academic (libraries and scholars), but monograph publishers also see sales of books through course adoptions (generally as textbooks for upper-level post-secondary courses) and in the general trade market. This more diverse audience has traditionally been a strength for university presses; the diversification of their core market offered some protection from financial strife should sales to one of those core audiences diminish. However, these markets have been arguably less secure in recent years due to increased competition from both large commercial educational publishers and general trade publishers, both of which have been slowly but steadily taking market share away from university presses.¹³ Moreover, competition from journal publishers has been ongoing in the library market, as libraries attempt to accommodate the rising costs of serials by slashing budgets for books. While small, independent academic journals have also experienced decreases in subscription sales to libraries due to the so-called serials crisis, the larger multinational-owned journals have seen little competition in their key library market, decisively setting them apart from university-press-published monographs.

This means that that university presses, already struggling in an increasingly competitive environment, cannot afford to have an open access model fail economically since their traditional print audiences, upon which they have relied for survival, are becoming less and less of a sure thing. Furthermore, these markets – general trade and textbook in particular – have not yet wholly embraced a digital model; that is, there is still the expectation that books will be available in print

form, rather than as e-books. As a result, monograph publishers cannot yet contemplate doing away with print entirely, as many journals have. Even in the digital-friendly library world, e-books are more unwieldy than journals for academics who wish to use them for research, due in part to a general aversion to reading long works on screen and the much higher costs associated with printing out a 242-page manuscript (relative to a 25 page journal article).

Revenues and funding

Most journals are funded primarily by subscription fees, mostly from libraries and institutions. A recent study of selected US-based journals in the humanities and social sciences found that roughly 85% of those journals' revenues came from subscriptions, 11% from advertising, and 5-6% from reprints, royalties, and back issue sales.¹⁴ Grants and endowments amounted to a mere 1.5%.¹⁵

For university press monograph publishers, the situation is markedly different. US figures indicate that books sales to all markets, including libraries, retail trade stores, courses, and individual scholars, still account for the largest portion of revenues, with less than 2% of revenues derived from sub-rights sales¹⁶ and none from advertising.¹⁷ The scenario for Canadian university presses differs yet again. While sales to the markets listed above still represent the lion's share of revenue, grants account for a sizeable contribution to the bottom line. ACUP members receive title grants from the Aid to Scholarly Publishing Program (ASPP) and block operating grants from the Canada Council and the Department of Canadian Heritage (which support all qualifying Canadian publishers). Many university presses also receive funding from their provincial arts councils and/or their host institutions, although the amount of such funding, if any, varies greatly from press to press. Most of this funding is also predicated on the payment of author royalties that derive from sales figures. For example, the Canada Council and most provincial funders require that publishers certify that they pay royalties to their authors, while the most important funding source, the Department of Canadian Heritage's Canada Book Fund, requires an auditor's statement certifying that royalties have been paid

Thus, with respect to revenues and funding, open access presents different challenges to monograph publishers, particularly to Canadian publishers, than it does to journals. Certainly, the need to recoup revenues lost from direct sales or subscriptions applies equally to both publishers, but monographs lack the funds from advertising that journals can still rely on. Moreover, the government funding that subsidizes Canadian university press publishing currently utilizes sales figures and royalty payments to determine funding eligibility. A switch to an open access model would thus necessitate a concomitant change in the overall funding structure that recognizes the drastically different revenue assumptions underlying OA.

The Ithaka Report

Highlights

- 2007's Ithaka report is one of the first broadly distributed documents to address the difficulties facing university presses in the digital age.
- The report is not intended to address open access but its examination of university press publishing touches on many of the issues that pertain to OA.
- Among its recommendations is the contentious suggestion that many of the functions that are currently carried out by university presses might be allocated to libraries in order to reduce costs. It also calls for university administrators to become more involved in how scholarly communication is carried out at their institutions.
- The report, while informative and provocative, can be seen as biased insofar as its authors serve on the board of JSTOR, a well-known digital archive for scholarly communication, and hold that archive up as a possible example of infrastructure that could meet the scholarly communication needs proposed in the report.

On 26 July 2007, Ithaka, a “not-for-profit organization dedicated to helping the academic community take full advantage of rapidly advancing information and networking technologies,”¹⁸ released “University Publishing in a Digital Age,” a document that set off a maelstrom of debate within the scholarly publishing community. Designed as a “qualitative review” of university publishing, the Ithaka report was not an overt champion of open access *per se*. Rather, it aimed to assess the importance of publishing, “the communication and broad dissemination of knowledge,” to universities in the internet age. In so doing, however, it touched on many of the issues that pertain open access, such as the need to develop online publishing capabilities for both backlist and frontlist titles and for “new emerging formats,” and it included the recommendation that universities “increase access to scholarship through new pricing models.”

What ignited the initial debate, however, was not the push for universities to put their research online. Rather, it was the implication that, in order to streamline the scholarly communication process, many of the traditional publishing functions of university presses might be assigned to university libraries, with the result that university presses would be subsumed into the university library, or in extreme cases, done away with altogether. The report noted that the future of scholarly communication lay in making it electronically available in multiple formats with varying levels of peer review. Libraries, it asserted, were taking action to support this vision, while university presses were seen as struggling to adapt to change. The university provosts interviewed for the study generally saw their university presses as mere accessories to the academic mission rather than as central players, or, if they were appreciative, had the sense that their days were numbered if they did not have a devoted champion in the administration. Librarians, for their part, mostly saw university presses as anachronisms doomed to extinction in the near future unless they found ways of making themselves more relevant to their host university's mission or collaborating with university libraries to reinvent themselves. The report concluded with several recommendations, the basic tenor of which was that university

administrators need to take a more active role in the publishing output of their institutions and that library and presses must work together to “create the intellectual products of the future which increasingly will be created and distributed in electronic media.”¹⁹

Perhaps anticipating the discussion that would ensue, the Ithaka report noted that university presses were in many ways caught between a rock and a hard place. The two key challenges facing them were to “find the best way to be good stewards of scholarship on behalf of the community (public good), while also creating value for their parent institution (private good).” They also had “to advance their businesses through commercial discipline ... while at the same time serving the not-for-profit demands of the community.”²⁰ The first challenge is one that touches upon the central mission of university presses: in holding up the standards of objective scholarship, few, if any, of them pursue a publishing program that gives special recognition to research emanating from their own institutions. To do so would be to risk engaging in what is known as “vanity publishing.” The press would exist mainly to trumpet the accomplishments of its host institution – a role many feel is more than adequately performed by the university’s public relations department. The second challenge addresses a concern that also lies at the heart of the open access debate: the economics of survival. As the report points out, university presses are often one of the few departments on campus that are expected to be largely self-sufficient: “they [university press directors] feel they are held to a different standard than all the cost centers on campus, that they are essentially penalized for pursuing a cost recovery model, which then becomes the basis for evaluating their performance. When they perform well (in financial terms), they are “rewarded” by having subsidies cut. When they run too large a deficit they are threatened with closure.”²¹

As a working paper provided for informational purposes only, the Ithaka report was in no way binding upon any universities, presses, or libraries. Its recommendations were offered for the consideration of the academic community in the hopes that some of them might be adopted and that, as a result, scholarly communication might become more open and amenable to digitization. However, the report was not without its biases. Funded by both Ithaka and JSTOR – a well-known digital archive for scholarly journal articles and other academic content – the report’s primary author was Laura Brown, a JSTOR trustee and the former president of Oxford University Press USA. She had also worked closely with Kevin Guthrie, JSTOR’s chairman, to produce JSTOR. Indeed, one of the proposals put forth in the report was the adoption of “a shared electronic publishing infrastructure across universities” that would “save costs, create scale, leverage expertise, innovate, unite the resources of the university ... extend the brand of American higher education (and each particular university within that brand), create a blended interlinked environment of fee-based to free information, and provide a robust alternative to commercial competitors”: in short, an infrastructure that JSTOR might well be able to provide.²²

Regardless of this underlying bias, however, the report did succeed in galvanizing discussion about the role of university presses and perhaps pushed many directors into considering how they might assure the ongoing viability of their publishing houses. Related in no small way to this discussion was the mounting pressure from government funders and individual scholars to

provide open access to scholarly research. University presses were faced more forcefully with the question of whether or not open access might be a viable business model for their industry and, if so, what structures needed to change to accommodate it.

II. Open Access in the International Context²³

According to Peter Suber, perhaps the most active advocate and most prolific archivist for OA in the US today, the first glimmers of open access can be traced back to 1966, when the US Department of Education launched ERIC, the Educational Resources Information Center, which since its inception, has aimed to provide barrier-free access to educational literature to support the use of educational research and information in improving practices in learning, teaching, educational decision-making, and research. Open access is possible as a digital project that can use of digital networks because of the advent in 1969 of ARPANET, the US Department of Defense's progenitor of what we now know as the internet.²⁴ Since that time, OA advocacy has spread around the world, arguably culminating in the Budapest Open Access Initiative, signed in February 2002. Recapping the individual developments in OA in an international context is well beyond the scope of this project,²⁵ however, an understanding of the current status of open access with respect to scholarly monographs in the US and Europe offers a valuable context for considering how we, in Canada, may wish to proceed in the future.

Open Access in the United States

Highlights

- STM journals are the main target of the OA movement in the US, although monographs have been implicated, namely in the Google Books Library Project lawsuit and the subsequent settlement.
- In 1999, BioMed Central, an OA repository for biomedical research articles, launches in the US.
- Some key funders of academic research in the US, such as the National Institutes of Health, have begun to mandate that any research they fund must be made available via open access.
- In 2008, Harvard University becomes the first North American university to mandate that all faculty research must be available on via open access.
- The Association of American University Presses (AAUP) has come out in support of maintaining current copyright legislation and has maintained a cautious and skeptical stance on the viability of open access for scholarly monograph publishers.
- Currently, fifteen American university presses offer their titles with through form of open access.

The open access movement in the US has, until recently, been focused on publishers of scientific, technical, and medical (STM) journals. The argument has been that this type of scholarship, in large part funded by taxpayer monies, should be accessible to all – not only wealthy drug companies and people affiliated with academic institutions who either could, or had to, afford the hefty price tag associated with STM journal subscriptions. Open access was heralded as the backbone of the “global knowledge economy” that would allow us all to prosper through the collaborative (scientific) innovation that would be possible with barrier-free access to STM research.²⁶ OA, at least for journals, has had some high-level supporters in the US as well. In 2003, the National Institutes of Health (NIH), a major scientific research funder, issued a “final” statement on data-sharing which required all major funding applications to address their plans for data-sharing as a funding requirement.²⁷ By 2008, the NIH had upgraded their OA requirements to mandate that all publications based on research funded by the NIH must be made available to PubMed Central, the NIH’s open access archive, for public access no later than twelve months after official publication.²⁸ Other notable OA projects that shaped the OA landscape in the US include the development of the Public Library of Science (PLOS) and the launching of BioMed Central. Founded in 2000 and funded by a number of private foundations, PLOS is a non-profit OA publisher of peer-reviewed journals whose mission is to make “the world’s scientific and medical literature a public resource.”²⁹ The launching of BioMe Central in 1999, on the other hand, represented the first initiative by a commercial publisher to offer free access to research reports in medicine and biology.³⁰ In 2001, BioMed Central began charging processing fees to authors in order to cover the costs of free online access, a practice that has since become the standard for commercial publishers offering OA publishing options.

The universities at the heart of STM research, and academic research in general, have also been active in the open access debate. Since 2005, a number of American universities have adopted OA

policies or resolutions, while Harvard's 2008 OA mandate³¹, the requirement that every faculty member grant the university the right to make their scholarly articles freely available, made it the first US university to take OA that far. With universities themselves beginning either to mandate open access or craft official OA policies, university presses began to be more forcefully confronted by calls for them to make their publications freely accessible.

In February 2007, the Association of American University Presses (AAUP), which counts among its members seven Canadian university presses,³² issued a statement on open access in response to these calls. Acknowledging that most of the push towards OA has been directed at scholarly journals, the AAUP recognized that monographs, too, had to be addressed in the discussion. A rebuttal of criticisms that university presses (UPs) have been resistant to change or hostile to the open access mandate, the AAUP statement affirmed that its members have always been open to using new technologies to further the dissemination and use-value of scholarship. It also lent its support to forms of open access that attempted "to balance the mission of scholarly communication with its costs,"³³ noting that many UPs had already initiated pilot OA projects that embraced this type of OA. However, the statement expressed concern about OA models that advocate abandoning a market economy in favour of a subsidy or "gift" economy, which posits that the costs of publication be covered by author/institutional subsidies to UPs, instead of by users as is the case in the traditional market economy. These models, which would require subsidies of at least \$20,000 to \$25,000 for an OA digital monograph, would result in publication being limited to those authors who could afford to pay, either individually or through institutional grants. The AAUP also argued that completely free-to-user OA risked the demise of well-established electronic archiving services, such as Johns Hopkins' Project MUSE, as well as an increase in the cost to UPs' parent institutions, should the revenues currently generated by sales disappear. Finally, the association cautioned that if the free-to-user OA model was rejected by commercial publishers, the raft of journals and monographs currently published by these presses might be abandoned – along with the vital research contained in them.

While the AAUP statement may have painted a grim picture of OA as envisioned by the BOAI, a number of US academic presses had already begun experimenting with different forms of open access. The National Academies Press (NAP) was revolutionary in its 1994 decision to provide free online full-text editions of its printed books, a practice it continues to this day. Against the prevailing logic of the industry regarding OA, NAP found that offering books for free on its website lead to greater sales of their printed counterparts.³⁴ While the NAP was surely the vanguard of OA in the scholarly monographs world, it was not alone for long. A number of university presses have since experimented with OA, offering free access in a variety of different ways. At the time of writing, US university presses offering some degree of open access number fifteen.³⁵

The American legal and legislative arenas have also been grappling with the challenge of OA through the lawsuits brought against Google in response to the Google Books Library Project, as well as through a pair of legislative bills brought to Congress with respect to both open access and copyright issues.

The Google Books Library Project, initially called Google Print for Libraries and then Google Book Search, was first made public on 14 December 2004³⁶ when Google announced that it was teaming up with the libraries of Harvard, Stanford, the University of Michigan, the University of Oxford, and the New York Public Library in a massive digitization project. The company's plan was to digitize those libraries' collections with the end goal of making them searchable online. The announcement set off a firestorm of discussion within publishing communities, many of which were concerned that Google's plan represented a blatant infringement of United States copyright law. Peter Givler, Executive Director of the AAUP, in a letter to Google,³⁷ made it clear that in the view of the AAUP's membership, the Google Books Library Project was a potential financial disaster for scholarly publishers who relied, in large part, on the sales of books and subsidiary rights underpinned by copyright, to sustain their businesses. Other publishers agreed. On 19 October 2005, McGraw-Hill, Simon & Shuster, Penguin Group USA, Pearson Education, and Wiley filed a lawsuit against Google seeking an injunction to prevent it from digitally copying and distributing copyrighted works without the permission of the copyright owners. The suit was coordinated and funded by the American Association of Publishers (AAP).³⁸ Additionally, Google was the defendant in a separate lawsuit filed by the Author's Guild, which similarly charged the company with infringing authors' copyrights through their digital scanning project.³⁹ Google, for its part, argued that its scanning project did not infringe on copyright and qualified as fair use, since the digitized books would promote wider access to the literature and because they had included an opt-out provision that ensured that the book(s) of any rights-holder who objected to the digitization would be removed from the Google Book Search program.

Three years later, in October 2008, Google reached a settlement agreement with both the publishers and the Authors Guild. The fine details of the settlement are beyond the scope of this paper but, in summary, the parties agreed that Google could proceed with the project provided they establish a "collecting society," to be called the Book Rights Registry (BRR). To fund the registry, Google would provide an initial 34.5 million USD followed by an ongoing contribution of 67% of revenues from the Library Project, which would be used to compensate copyright owners for past and future uses of their books. In November 2009, the settlement agreement was amended to address concerns about "orphan" books (books with unknown rights-holders but which are still in copyright) and stipulated that the BRR was required to search for rights-holders who had not been identified and to hold revenue for them for at least ten years, at which point the BRR could ask the court for permission to distribute those funds to nonprofits benefiting rights-holders and the reading public. The amendment further addressed the issue of international authors whose works might be included in the digitization project, specifying that the settlement applied only to books registered with the US copyright office or which were published in Canada, the UK, or Australia.⁴⁰

The Google case is significant to open access discussions since its outcome bears directly on what constitutes fair use of copyrighted works. While readers must bear in mind that, at the time of writing, the proposed settlement has yet to receive final approval from the courts, it upholds the basic tenet that traditional copyright holders are entitled to compensation for public distribution

of their works, and that parties seeking to digitally distribute those works are required to both adequately compensate rights-holders and attempt to find rights-holders of information they wish to digitize. In short, the settlement reifies the notion that financial obligations adhering to copyright cannot be entirely dismissed through claims of fair use.

While the Google Books Library Project seems largely to uphold traditional notions of copyright (though it will no doubt have implications down the road that cannot yet be known), the drive towards OA, especially with respect to research underwritten with federal funds, has spurred the introduction of two bills brought to the US Congress over the past decade that seek directly to amend the extent of copyright legislation. The “Public Access to Science Act,” colloquially known as the Sabo bill, was introduced in June 2003 and proposed that any research papers authored by scientists receiving substantial federal funding for the work in question should be considered ineligible for copyright protection. The bill failed to proceed and was not resurrected, but generated extensive public debate on open access.⁴¹ Indeed, its very proposition was a sign that open access to scholarly research was of significant enough import to make it onto the national agenda. In 2009, the issue of research and copyright was raised again – but this time from the other direction. The “Fair Copyright in Research Works Act,” which went to committee in February 2009, is a direct response to the NIH requirement of OA to NIH-funded research papers. In short, the act “prohibits any federal agency from imposing any condition, in connection with a funding agreement, that requires the transfer or license to or for a federal agency, or requires the absence or abandonment, of specified exclusive rights of a copyright owner in an extrinsic work.”⁴² The previous version of the bill, which was introduced in the previous Congress but died in session, was opposed by OA advocates⁴³ but supported by the AAUP.⁴⁴ As the current version of the bill is still active and it is too early to tell whether OA will keep its footing with respect to federally funded research in the US. Interestingly, in June 2009, perhaps in response to the Fair Copyright in Research Act, the Committee on Science and Technology of the United States House of Representatives convened a roundtable on scholarly publishing, with the goal of developing “consensus recommendations for expanding public access to the journal articles arising from research funded by agencies of the United States government.”⁴⁵ With representatives from academic administration, librarians, information science researchers, and scientific journal publishers, the roundtable’s core recommendation was that “each federal research funding agency should expeditiously but carefully develop and implement an explicit public access policy that brings about free public access to the results of the research that it funds as soon as possible after those results have been published in a peer-reviewed journal.”⁴⁶ It went on to make eight other recommendations, among which was that specific embargo periods should be established between publication and public access. Notably, it acknowledged that while science journals seem to be adequately provided for with a zero to twelve month period, other fields, such as the social sciences and humanities, may require longer embargoes. While the report certainly represents a ringing endorsement for open access, its acknowledgement of the need for embargoes recognizes that such access has a real impact on the financial viability of research publishers.

Admittedly, much of the OA lay of the land, as described here, pertains to journals rather than monographs. However, since technology is advancing daily and shapes how and what we read electronically, monograph publishers must recognize that what happens with journals will undoubtedly have a bearing on what will be expected of books in the future. A burgeoning cross-border development has come out of John Willinsky's Public Knowledge Project (PKP), which, since its inception in 1998, has advocated for open access to scholarly research while also developing technological solutions that foster its adoption, particularly in the realm of journal publication. In 2008, PKP began work on its Open Monograph Press (OMP) software, which is currently in the development and testing phase. While the software is not designed solely for OA publishing, it has been designed with the goal of facilitating OA, should a publisher embrace that model. As Willinsky notes, "the software does not determine the economic model used by the press. Certainly, we have been developing systems designed to support open access, but we have learned that to encourage increased access to research and scholarship, we have needed to build systems that are financially ecumenical, if not agnostic."⁴⁷ The OMP project, with which Athabasca University Press is a collaborator, will be discussed in more detail in subsequent sections of this paper. The OMP represents a potentially important technological contribution to the development of a workable OA business model.

Open Access in Europe

Highlights

- The Budapest Open Access Initiative of 2002 is followed in 2003 by the Berlin Declaration on Open Access to Knowledge in the Sciences and Humanities.
- In 2006, the European Commission (EC) and the European Research Council (ERC) signals their support for OA for publicly funded research.
- By December 2007, the ERC states its intent to mandate that all ERC-funded research must be freely and publicly available no later than six months after publication.
- In 2007, the EC calls on all member states to develop formal policies on open access of publicly funded research.
- In the 2007-2013 budget, the EC allocates 20% of research monies specifically for projects whose results will be made available via OA.
- Several OA repositories, particularly in the sciences, are active in Europe, including the UK version of PubMed Central. At least 32 European countries have a minimum of one OA repository for research emanating from their universities and research institutions.
- In 2009, the Joint Information Systems Committee in the UK releases a report that estimates that billions of pounds could be saved by moving scholarly communications to an OA basis. The Publishers Association, the Association of Learned and Professional Society Publishers, and the International Association of Scientific, Technical and Medical Publishers strenuously object, and charge that the information used in the report was highly biased and not based on real-world figures.
- Bloomsbury Academic launches in 2010 as the purely OA scholarly imprint of the trade publisher Bloomsbury.

The progress of OA in Europe has largely paralleled that in the US. Indeed, since the very concept of open access has within it the breaking down of barriers, it should not be surprising that developments in open access in one country are often accompanied by similar, sometimes more expansive, developments in others. The Budapest Open Access Initiative of 2002 although based in Europe, was international in terms of its signatories and scope. It was followed in 2003 by the Berlin Declaration on Open Access to Knowledge in the Sciences and Humanities, which broadened the BOAI by explicitly including cultural heritage, along with research in the sciences and humanities. The Berlin declaration was signed by representatives of research and cultural institutions from around the world, with the majority in Europe.⁴⁸

In March 2006, the European Commission (EC) released the results of their study of the scientific publication system in Europe, which recommended that the public should have guaranteed access to publicly funded research “at the time of publication and also long term.” The report acknowledged that at the time, electronic publications might have different cost/profit models than traditional print publications, and so also proposed “eliminating unfavourable tax treatment of electronic publications and encouraging public funding and public-private partnerships to create digital archives in areas with little commercial investment.”⁴⁹ In December 2006, the European Research Council (ERC) issued a statement in favour of open access, and indicating its intent to mandate that any ERC-funded research be deposited in an OA archive no later than 12

months after publication.⁵⁰ By December 2007, the ERC amended its position to shorten the acceptable embargo period to six months after publication.⁵¹

In February 2007, the EC held a conference to discuss how European governments and institutions could best respond to the challenges of access, dissemination and preservation of scientific information in the digital age. The results of that conference, along with other relevant policy documentation, lead to the publication of the Council's "Conclusions on scientific information in the digital age: access, dissemination and preservation," in which the Council significantly acknowledged the following points related to OA: "the need to ensure rapid and wide access to publicly funded research results," and "the importance of scientific output resulting from publicly funded research being available on the Internet at no cost to the reader under economically viable circumstances, including delayed open access."⁵² The Council went on to recommend that, from 2008 onwards, the EC and its member states define clear policies with respect to OA, and promote "through these policies, access through the internet to the results of publicly financed research, at no cost to the reader, taking into consideration economically sustainable ways of doing this, including delayed open access,"⁵³ as well as "explor[e] the possibility for national funding bodies to define common basic principles on open access."⁵⁴ The Council further invited the EC to experiment with different forms of OA in projects funded by EU Research Framework Programmes, in an effort to document and define the results of such experiments on the scientific community and the public.

The publication, in July 2008, of the EC's handbook on open access – "Open Access: Opportunities and Challenges"⁵⁵ – essentially marked the Commission's public endorsement of the principles of OA. Produced in conjunction with the German Commission for UNESCO, and initially authored by that body in 2007, the handbook was partly an OA primer for the uninitiated, as well as a how-to (for universities and individual scholars), and an overview of open access from a number of different social and economic perspectives. Like much of the available literature elsewhere, the handbook largely limits itself to discussion of OA with respect to journal/data publishing, and does not significantly address monographs. The majority of the contributors to the handbook take a pro-OA stance. Two contributions from publishers – represented by contributions from Wiley-Blackwell and the International Association of Scientific, Technical, and Medical Publishers – raise concerns about the viability of open access, in terms of economics, quality assurance, and maintenance of a clear version of record.

A month later, in August 2008, the EC officially launched an OA pilot project, requiring that certain recipients of EU funding for projects representing 20% of the EC's research programme budget from 2007 – 2013 make the published results of their research freely available to the public. Specifically, these researchers are required to "deposit peer reviewed research articles or final manuscripts resulting from their FP7 projects into an online repository [and] make their best efforts to ensure open access to these articles within either six (health, energy, environment, parts of information and communication technologies, research infrastructures) or twelve months (social sciences and humanities, science in society) after publication."⁵⁶ The results of this pilot project are currently being tracked and no interim information has yet been released.

As in the US, supporters of OA, particularly within the life sciences, have moved ahead of legislation and government funding mandates to establish OA repositories where copies of peer-reviewed journal articles are archived and freely available to the public and other researchers. In the UK, for example, UK PubMed Central (<http://ukpmc.ac.uk>), which launched in January 2007, was modeled after the US-based, NIH-sponsored PubMed Central to provide “a stable, permanent, and free-to-access online digital archive of full-text, peer-reviewed research publications”⁵⁷ in the biomedical and life sciences. In the Netherlands, the Digital Academic Repositories programme, now known as the National Academic Research and Collaborations Information System (<http://www.narcis.info/index/tab/narcis>), a joint effort of all fourteen Dutch universities and other significant Dutch research institutions, provides free access to almost 200,000 scientific publications, as well as data sets, and information on Dutch researchers, research projects, and research institutions. Most other European countries have some form of OA repository (OAR). OpenDOAR, an online directory of open access repositories, keeps listings of OARs by continent and country, and shows at least one OAR for thirty-two countries in Europe.⁵⁸ Some of these are joint efforts, some are run by individual universities, and others are international and serve specific areas of study. An important example of the latter kind has been spearheaded by the European Organization for Nuclear Research (CERN). A 2006 report by that organization proposed an OA implementation and business model, known as SCOAP³ – the Sponsoring Consortium for Open Access Publishing in Particle Physics. Under this model, a group of research institutions, funding bodies, and libraries would assume the cost of funding the publication of important journals in particle physics as these journals transition to OA. Rather than subscribing to the journals, each SCOAP³ partner would instead contribute an equivalent amount to the consortium, which would take over funding for the journals. These journals would then be made freely accessible over the internet. The Consortium estimates that the maximum annual budget for this transition project would be significantly lower than the amount currently spent worldwide on subscription fees to these highly specialized journals.⁵⁹ As the EC handbook on open access notes, the beauty of the SCOAP³ model “lies in the fact that publishers maintain an important role and that authors do not have to finance the cost of publication themselves.”⁶⁰

In a 2005 working paper, the OECD’s Working Party on the Information Economy presented the results of their study of scientific and scholarly research publishing. Their central question was “whether there are new opportunities and new models for scholarly publishing that would better serve researchers and better communicate and disseminate research findings.”⁶¹ The report itself failed to answer the question with any decisiveness, providing instead an overview of the state of the nation of scholarly publishing, as well as a qualitative comparison of three different publishing models: subscription publishing, open access publishing, and self-archiving (also known as the green road to OA). In an attempt to lend an economic analysis to the discussion initiated by the OECD, in 2009, the Joint Information Systems Committee (JISC) of the UK, published the results of their own study, which mounted a comparison of the same publishing models, but from a financial standpoint. While their report delves into a number of technical economic considerations that are quite specific to the UK market, their basic conclusions were that, in comparison to the traditional subscription model of journal publishing, both self-archiving

and open access publishing were significantly more cost-effective, with the former being the most economical publishing strategy of all. While the study does devote a very small portion of its discussion to a cost-comparison of traditional print monographs with OA e-books, the bulk of the report refers to journal publishing. While the authors do make the claim that their conclusions account for book publishing, the level of analysis devoted to this sector is minimal. Their conclusions with respect to this portion of the industry, therefore, are decidedly less thoroughly supported.

The JISC report, in its summary of implications for publishers and the publishing industry, noted that a wholesale shift to OA or self-archiving models would, of necessity, result in “a reduction of revenue to the publishing industry.” Such a reduction would, the report goes on to say, “imply a reduction of activity and employment in the industry. Such adjustments are difficult for those concerned, but the economy is a dynamic system ... [a]s a result, the capital and labour no longer employed in publishing would be employed in an alternative activity. Given the relative size of the publishing industry and the rate at which alternative models are being adopted, it is unlikely that the UK economy would have difficulty adjusting to such a change.”⁶² As Jim Ashling notes, even as the JISC document was designed to highlight the costs and benefits of scholarly publishing to the UK’s knowledge economy, it paid “scant recognition [to] the economic and social benefits contributed to the UK by British publishers and societies.”⁶³ Moreover, he notes wryly that the report’s assurance that an alternative activity would provide new employment for publishing professionals is not accompanied by any “guidance on what the ‘alternative activities’ for those left unemployed might be.”⁶⁴ For their part, UK publishers firmly rebutted many of the assertions put forth in the JISC report. In a joint statement, The Publishers Association, the Association of Learned and Professional Society Publishers, and the International Association of Scientific, Technical and Medical Publishers charged that the report was based on assumptions derived not from actual industry figures, but rather from the authors’ own estimates. They further noted that the model used was theoretical, rather than real-world, and that while the study claimed to be based on industry consultation, “none of the publishing trade associations or any of the major commercial or society publishers were consulted in advance of publication.”⁶⁵ The joint statement went on to critique specific assumptions underlying the JISC report. The report authors issued their own response to these criticisms, largely maintaining their original position, but remaining open to continuing discussions with UK publishers on the report’s key recommendations.

JISC assertions aside, monograph publishing in Europe, like the US, has not seen nearly as much activity as has been the case with journals. Still, some European publishers are experimenting with OA for books, and while it is still too early to tell how these trials will work out, they are worth following as possible models and/or cautionary tales. Open Access Publishing in European Networks (OAPEN) is the first broadscale OA project devoted to monograph publishing in the humanities and social sciences. A partnership of eight European university presses, the project aims to “find a financial model which is appropriate to scholarly humanities monographs, a publishing platform which is beneficial to all users and create a network of publishing partners

across Europe and the rest of the world.”⁶⁶ OAPEN is currently funded by a 30-month, €900,000 grant from the EC.

Dr Saskia de Vries, director of Amsterdam University Press, a key OAPEN partner, has been a vocal supporter of OA for monographs. In a 2007 article, she came out in favour of a combination of OA and print-on-demand (POD). “I believe that digital disclosure of academic information via open access could actually lead to more books being sold,”⁶⁷ she wrote, citing Amsterdam University Press’s successful experience with POD technology at the University of Amsterdam as evidence. Asserting that “[o]pen access is a fact of life, and it is here to stay ... the whole debate about open access should be about how to use it,”⁶⁸ she also pragmatically reminded readers that OA publishing is not cost-free. Moreover, in a statement that echoed – or rather, predated – the one made by the JISC, de Vries advises her publishing colleagues to brace themselves for change: “if parts of publishers’ traditional role [sic] are being taken over by others, should publishers nevertheless be kept in business to protect those 36,000 jobs? Of course not ... It is very hard to predict what the future holds for us all – publishers, librarians, and academics. But I would like to remind you of a quotation attributed to Charles Darwin: ‘It is not the strongest of the species that survive, nor the most intelligent, but the ones most responsive to change.’”⁶⁹ Amsterdam University Press, for its part, is putting its money where de Vries’ mouth is. It is currently collaborating with the International Migration, Integration, and Social Cohesion in Europe (IMISCOE) research group to produce some 200 publications over the next five years, all of which will be made digitally available in an OA repository. The IMISCOE project will be disseminated via Amsterdam University Press, and funded by a grant from the EU.⁷⁰ At present, ten full-text books stemming from this project are available in PDF-form on the Amsterdam University Press website. Each of these is also available for purchase via POD.

A similar experiment is being conducted in the UK by Bloomsbury Academic (BA), the scholarly imprint of the British trade house, Bloomsbury Publishing. The brainchild of publisher Frances Pinter, Bloomsbury Academic will publish exclusively in the social sciences and humanities (SSH) and will make all of its titles available “free of charge online, with free downloads, for non-commercial purposes immediately upon publication, using Creative Commons licences. The works will also be sold as books, using the latest short-run litho technologies or Print on Demand (POD).”⁷¹ BA plans to release its first titles online in early 2010. According to the BA website, its “state-of-the-art” distribution and display platform is currently under development, also due to be launched in early 2010. The platform promises that BA “will be plugged into the world beyond the site itself, with connections to blogs, podcasts and webcasts to accompany and enhance the world-class content inside. Within the site, additional readers’ resources will augment the core texts, with role-based navigation helping core groups make the best of Bloomsbury Academic.”⁷² BA is undoubtedly an ambitious undertaking by any standards and Pinter acknowledges that the financial backing available from Bloomsbury Publishing, the house behind the Harry Potter phenomenon, is essential to the project: “I could only attempt this by having the resources of a major publishing house behind me to experiment with what I see as radically new business models, highlighting the strengths of both print and digital communications.”⁷³ As BA has not yet published its first titles using this business model, its performance in the marketplace as a viable

financial model remains to be seen. In what seems like qualified optimism, Pinter herself refused to commit to the survival of the initial BA business model. “I believe this is a beginning, not the end of creating a sustainable business model,” she wrote. “While positioning Bloomsbury Academic to provide all the additional added value features scholars are still seeking from independent presses, it will at the same time explore other avenues of income generation around the core content. The opportunities for Web 2.0 in SSH publishing are only just emerging, and our team will be at the forefront.”⁷⁴ This inclusion of value-added Web 2.0-based services in BA’s ultimate business plan, however preliminary, is notable, and largely under-discussed in the literature. It bears further investigation by publishers considering a switch to OA, and will be discussed in more detail in the Possible Business Models section that appears later in this paper.

Interestingly, both de Vries and Pinter make the observation – and assumption – that monographs differ from journals in their innate suitability to on-screen reading. In arguing that the printed book will not be killed off by the introduction of a digital OA counterpart, de Vries claims that “[n]o academic reads more than a few pages on the internet, or prints out 300 pages; so even if the full text is available in a repository, the printed book will still be wanted.”⁷⁵ Similarly, Pinter makes the assertion that “[o]nce a book is read more than twice in a library it is actually cheaper than printing out copies for individual users who either discard them or leave them on their personal shelves ... People still need to read a 300-page exposition and hate doing it on a screen.”⁷⁶ While both may be right at this juncture, their observations may have a limited shelf-life. As we have noted in a previous section, advances in e-book reader technology and market-share may make such assertions quickly obsolete.

Europe, then, is no further advanced than the US in terms of OA. The experiments that are being conducted at present are very much in the early days, and there is little to no data available by which to assess how OA is affecting monograph publishing. However, what is clear is that OA in Europe is a topic of great concern to policymakers, publishers, and scholars, and that there is both the political will and the financial wherewithal to explore its possibilities further.

III. Open Access in Canada

Highlights

- The OA movement is advancing in Canada as it is in both the US and Europe, particularly with respect to journal publishing.
- In 2008, erudit.org emerges as Canada's most advanced digital repository, publishing, and research platform that offers 80% of its content completely free. All content older than two years is available for free to the public, while more recent content is accessed by subscription.
- The Synergies project, focused on the social sciences and humanities (SSH), launched in 2009 and currently in development, aims to provide mostly open access to scholarly research in the SSH.
- Nine scientific research funders, including the Canadian Institutes for Health Research, currently mandate that research they fund must be made available via OA.
- Both the Canadian Association of Research Libraries and the Canadian Library Association have made official statements in support of open access.
- Canadian monograph publishers should be prepared to face more forceful calls for open access to their publications.
- The Canadian Federation of the Humanities and Social Sciences, the umbrella organization that supports the Aid to Scholarly Publishers Program, has issued a statement in support of OA.
- The Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council has also stated its support for OA but has not implemented any mandate that research it funds must be made available on an OA basis.
- The Canada Council and the Department of Canadian Heritage, both important funders of Canadian publishing, have not yet stated any official position on OA or how it may impact funding in the future.

The state of open access in Canada can be characterized in much the same way as that in the US and Europe. As in those regions, much of the discussion on OA in this country has focused on journals and has arisen as a result of the so-called serials crisis in libraries that has afflicted Canadian libraries as much as it has their counterparts across the Atlantic and to the south. Indeed, OA journal publishing in this country has been burgeoning. As of this writing, the Directory of Open Access Journals (DOAJ) lists 137 OA journals from Canada, or just under 10% of Canada's academic journal output. By contrast, the DOAJ lists 998 OA journals from the US, which represents approximately 5% of that country's academic journal publication.⁷⁷ These figures indicate that OA has a solid base in Canadian journal publishing, and should seem encouraging to Canadian OA advocates. However, journal publishing is only one front on the OA battleground. Of equal importance are the availability of open archives where scholars can deposit their work (peer reviewed, non-peer reviewed, and works in progress), as well as institution-backed OA mandates to ensure that such archives, where they exist, are comprehensive records of national and discipline-specific scholarship. As noted in Section 2: The Green and Gold Roads to Open Access, open archives do not necessarily distinguish between peer reviewed and non-peer reviewed work. As a result, access to open archives does not ensure the quality of

the scholarship contained in them, nor do they replace peer-reviewed publications as the primary source of reliable scholarly material.

When it comes to open archives, Canada is still in the developing stages. Most of our fifty-one⁷⁸ open archives are single-institution archives, designed to house the research output of scholars at particular universities. Of these, several are still in the pilot stage. A notable exception to this is *éruudit.org*, a partially open archive that is the result of the collaboration of three Quebec universities – the Université de Montréal, Université Laval, and the Université du Québec à Montréal. Established in 1998 as a digital publishing platform, the site underwent a number of changes before emerging in 2008 as a highly advanced digital repository, publishing, and research platform that allows for advanced browsing, searching, and filtering of content, as well the capacity to export search result citations and to search and browse through the collections of partner platforms. While *éruudit* is committed to the wide dissemination of scholarly materials, offering 80% of its content completely free, at the behest of journal publishers, it maintains a subscription model for the remainder. This model uses a “moving wall principle for filtered access,” with journal content less than two years old reserved for paying subscribers.⁷⁹ *Éruudit*’s platform formed the basis for the Synergies project, “a not-for-profit platform for the publication and dissemination of research results in the social sciences and humanities published in Canada”⁸⁰ that is currently in development. Stemming from an investment of almost fourteen million dollars, 5.8 million of which came from the Canada Foundation for Innovation (CFI), an independent corporation of the Canadian government, Synergies is unique insofar as it focuses on the Canadian social sciences and humanities. Like *Éruudit*, however, the project is not wholly open access. While details are scant as to how much of the information available will be OA, the Synergies beta site indicates that while the promotion of OA is a goal, participating publishers can expect to gain revenues generated by “the ongoing commercialization of collections,” which will include subscriptions and “commercial agreements with national and international research library consortia.”⁸¹ In the life sciences, Canada houses PubMed Central Canada (PMC Canada), a Canadian version of the American PubMed Central (PMC). A joint effort of the Canadian Institutes for Health Research (CIHR) and the National Research Council’s Canada Institute for Scientific and Technical Research, PMC Canada is a completely free-to-access full-text archive, which links up with PMC in the US, while also managing the submission of Canadian-funded biomedical and health research to the joint PMC database.⁸² PMC Canada does not charge any subscription fees, but relies on the OA release policies of individual journals to determine the length of embargo periods. No maximum embargo period is enforced, with the exception of published research funded by the CIHR, which mandates that such research must be made freely available either through an OA repository or via the publisher no later than six months following the date of publication.⁸³ The CIHR OA mandate is currently one of nine such mandates that exist in Canada,⁸⁴ all of which are in the sciences.

University OA mandates are even less common in Canada, with Athabasca University (AU) being the only Canadian university to formally request the deposit of all research performed by its faculty into the university’s repository. However, AU stops short of insisting that such research be OA, allowing that “[t]he contract with the publisher determines whether the article is restricted

(lives in the repository as a record of the AU's research but is not accessible online by searchers) or open access (accessible online by searchers).⁸⁵ The University of Calgary, while not mandating its authors to deposit their research into OA repositories, took the step of facilitating publication in OA journals through its Open Access Authors Fund. First established in 2008, the fund's purpose is to pay publisher fees for articles to be published in OA journals.⁸⁶

Librarians, for their part, are stalwartly in support of the OA movement in this country. The Canadian Association of Research Libraries (CARL) was an original signatory of the Budapest Open Access Initiative, and has since been active in promoting OA among university faculty and researchers, as well as with other scholarly communications stakeholders, such as the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC).⁸⁷ The Canadian Library Association, which represents librarians in college, university, public, special (corporate, non-profit and government) and school libraries, has also issued a position statement in support of open access, encouraging libraries to “support and encourage policies requiring open access to research supported by Canadian public funding ... raise awareness of library patrons and other key stakeholders about open access ... support the development of open access in all of its varieties, including gold (OA publishing) and green (OA self-archiving).”⁸⁸

Much of the lay-of-the-land in terms of the OA climate in Canada, then, seems to parallel that of the US and Europe. While the movement here has not claimed a university-based OA mandate like that of Harvard University, or a broad funding OA mandate, like that put in place by the EC, OA has certainly arrived in Canada, and is rapidly gaining momentum. So what does this mean for Canadian scholarly monograph publishers?

First, Canada's monograph publishers should be prepared to face more forceful calls for open access from their constituencies – primarily from academics themselves, but also from university administrations and possibly from national funders of both scholarly research and the publishers themselves. This is the direction that developments in the US and Europe seem to be taking and there is no reason to believe that Canada will not eventually follow suit. However, despite the ongoing similarities among these regions, there are some notable differences that contribute to Canada's unique position with respect to implementing open access in monograph publishing.

In 2005, the CARL published the results of a three-year study on scholarly communications in Canada, which highlighted major trends specific to the Canadian situation. Among these were the observations that “the majority of articles and monographs written by Canadian researchers are published outside Canada,” and that “Canada is a ‘net importer’ of information resources. Although Canadian researchers are productive authors, the Canadian research community imports far more scholarly publications than it authors or produces.”⁸⁹

Because Canadian researchers often publish their work abroad, the volume of scholarship that is ultimately “housed” in Canadian presses is much lower than the dollar figure of government-funded research might suggest would be the case. This means that Canadian scholarly publishers trying to make ends meet from Canadian-authored scholarship have a much smaller pool to draw

from on the one hand, and that libraries seeking to ensure that Canadian scholarship resides on their shelves must negotiate with both commercial and non-profit publishers from outside of Canada, thus being forced to pay the often exorbitant subscription fees charged for international journals. Ultimately, then, the financial squeeze that this trend places on both publishers and libraries is not simply a matter of changing the situation in Canada. A shift to OA in Canadian publishing alone will not even begin to solve the budgetary crises in our libraries. Mandates by Canadian university administrations requiring the OA publication of all faculty research might help in terms of making more Canadian-based research freely available, but even this will be only a drop in the bucket, since “Canada is a ‘net importer’ of information.”

Canada’s smaller number of universities and population, relative to the US and Europe, is also a mitigating factor in the comparative viability of OA for Canadian scholarly publishers. Most of these publishers specialize in some form of Canadian-focused studies, and thus have a limited market for their books and journals. Going OA for these books, assuming that printed versions would still be available for purchase, opens Canadian UPs up to a significant risk of declining revenues, which, in an industry that already operates on slim margins, could prove fatal.

Perhaps the most important of difference between the Canadian situation and that in the US or Europe is the funding structure of the Canadian publishing industry. Unlike in the United States, where university presses are funded almost exclusively by revenues from sales,⁹⁰ Canadian university presses, like the rest of Canada’s publishers, receive a significant part of their operating budgets through grants from the Canadian government. Because the Canadian publishing industry has long been dwarfed by the output and market share of its US counterpart, publishing in Canada is considered a cultural activity, and as such, falls under the protection of the Department of Canadian Heritage (DCH). As mentioned previously, Canadian scholarly publishers are eligible to apply for annual grants from both DCH, as well as from the Canada Council for the Arts. Currently, the amounts of the DCH grants are determined by a publisher’s past and projected *revenues*. Grants from the Canada Council, on the other hand, are awarded on a title-by-title basis determined by the average deficit across the genre to which the title belongs, and require a minimum print run of 350 copies. Additionally, scholarly publishers may also apply for funding from the Aid to Scholarly Publications Program (ASPP), run by the Canadian Federation for the Humanities and Social Sciences (CFHSS). These grants are available to publishers wishing to make their titles available only in electronic form provided that they are published on an open-access basis, and that they meet other ASPP eligibility requirements.

The problem with switching to open access, then, for most Canadian UPs is much deeper than restructuring their own business models. Much of the infrastructure around the publishing industry in this country has been built on the assumption of a print-based model; digital considerations are very much in the developmental stage at this point in time. In principle, the CFHSS, also known as the Federation, has issued a statement in support of open access⁹¹ In an e-mail correspondence, Kel Morin-Parsons, Manager of the ASPP, acknowledged that the Federation supported OA’s aim of disseminating scholarly research “to the widest possible audience with the fewest possible barriers.” The ASPP’s support for OA is demonstrated “by

seeking to encourage and work with scholarly presses that put it into practice ... Essentially, the ASPP and Federation believe that no paradigm shifts overnight, nor would anyone reasonably expect it to do so – but that a willingness to explore the principle, via pilot projects or even individual titles placed in open access, could provide some excellent data about the costs and benefits of OA publishing for scholarly books.”⁹²

SSHRC, for its part, has also adopted, in principle, a policy of open access for its research support programs, but unlike the CIHR or NSERC, has held off on mandating OA for publications stemming from research it has funded. J. Craig McNaughton, Director of Knowledge Mobilization and Program Integration at SSHRC, notes that the organization has instead chosen to “take an awareness-raising, educational and promotional approach in this transitional period when the needed infrastructure and resources are still being developed to support Open Access.”⁹³ McNaughton further notes that SSHRC has been focusing on “encouraging and facilitating the shift of scholarly journals to online and open-access business models” and has been a champion of the CFI-funded initiatives, the Synergies program and the Canadian Research Knowledge Network (CRKN), which has provided significant funds to support the digitization and dissemination of Canadian books through library acquisitions.⁹⁴

At present, the Canada Council (CC), which administers the Block Grant program to support Canadian publishers, lacks an official policy on how/if open access will be incorporated into its granting structure. Elizabeth Eve, Program Officer for the Writing and Publishing Section, makes the point that the eligibility criteria for CC grants are founded on supporting titles for which authors are paid “in line with industry standards.” Moreover, because the Council is largely concerned with supporting literary publishing, its eligibility criteria are constructed with literary publishers in mind, most of whom are not particularly concerned with open access. Eve notes that while the CC does not currently have a policy in place, “as things evolve there may be some clarity about how the Council would include digital editions into the Block Grant program.”⁹⁵ At present, the Department of Canadian Heritage also does not have an official policy or statement on open access and it is unclear whether one is forthcoming or not.⁹⁶

A shift to open access is likely to require a restructuring of the funding paradigms that currently support the Canadian scholarly publishing industry. At the very least, it will involve official policies from funders that make OA titles eligible for grants. It may also require higher levels of subsidies, since most university presses stay solvent by augmenting their sales revenues through grants, a situation which may not be sustainable at current levels if an OA version of a title is offered at the same time as a printed one. Indeed, if a press chooses to offer OA-only versions of its titles, then sales revenues would disappear altogether.

If the government funding bodies that largely sustain Canadian university presses are unable or refuse to augment subventions to cover the loss of revenue that might result from a shift to OA, some presses might choose to turn to their host universities to make up the shortfall, assuming those institutions have the financial wherewithal to contribute. Indeed, the Ithaka report hints at this in its recommendations that university administrators should recognize the importance of

publishing to the “core mission and activities of universities” while also developing “ a strategic approach to publishing ... including what publication services should be provided to your constituents, how they should be provided and funded, how publishing should relate to tenure decisions, and a position on intellectual assets.” More explicitly, the report urges administrators to “create the organizational structure necessary to implement this [strategic approach to publishing] and leverage the resources of the university” and “commit resources to deliver an agreed strategic plan for scholarly communication.”⁹⁷ While the degree of funding that Canadian university presses presently receive from their home institutions varies, a shift to OA may require both an increase in institutional funding and the development of formal scholarly communications plans of the kind recommended by the Ithaka report.

In the event that no significant changes are made to the funding structures that support Canadian scholarly presses but OA mandates surface, either through pressure from the academy as a whole, or less directly through mandates initiated by research funders, those presses will have to find a way to make up any budgetary shortfall that might arise from implementing OA. The most common model is the one used by Amsterdam University Press and proposed by Bloomsbury Academic: offering titles free of charge online alongside a print-on-demand version of the same title. In this case, academics, libraries, and the general public would likely see an increase in the price of the printed book as the unit costs of the POD products would generally be higher than traditional litho printing, and as the publishers seek to recoup potential revenue losses from offering titles as OA online. That said, this does not necessarily have to be the case: Rice University Press in Houston, TX, operates using this model, but manages to produce POD copies for sale at a cost that is actually lower than traditionally printed books. This is enabled in large part, however, by the savings the press claims by bypassing the time-consuming and labour-intensive peer-review process. In an innovative move, Rice’s books are books that have been peer reviewed at other scholarly presses, but have become stuck in “the economic logjam in academic publishing,” that is, they have been deemed academically important but financially impossible.⁹⁸ Additionally, Rice University Press is funded by its host university, as well as by private foundations,⁹⁹ although the specific support offered is unknown.

Given these obstacles to publishing monographs using an OA model, few Canadian presses have had the financial wherewithal or the organizational tenacity to undertake open access. Athabasca University, which recently launched Canada’s newest scholarly monograph publisher, Athabasca University Press (AUP), stands as an exception.

Case Study: Athabasca University Press

“Knowledge is too important to be left to free enterprise.”¹⁰⁰

Athabasca University Press (AUP), launched in 2008, is the “centre of scholarly publishing expertise” at Athabasca University (AU), an open university specializing in online and distance education, with campuses located in Athabasca, St. Albert, Edmonton, and Calgary. What distinguishes Athabasca University Press from other Canadian university presses is that it was established at a time when digital publishing had already become commonplace and the internet was already moving to embrace the interactivity of Web 2.0.¹⁰¹ Moreover, it is affiliated with an open university that has as its mission the breaking down of barriers to higher education. Citing Terry Anderson, a professor and Canada Research Chair of distance education at AU, Walter Hildebrandt, AUP’s director, says that central to the press’s operation is the idea that “knowledge is too important to be left to free-enterprise.” Open access, then, makes ideological sense in both its commitment to the free dissemination of knowledge and the lowering of barriers to information.

Hildebrandt came to AUP from the University of Calgary press – a traditional bricks-and-mortar scholarly publishing enterprise – and admits he had reservations about the OA vision of AU president Frits Pannekoek. He worried that open access would dissuade authors from publishing with AUP, and was warned by colleagues that publishing OA titles would lead to the demise of both the printed book and with it, AUP’s hope of revenues. To his relief, he has found that neither of these things have come to pass.

So how does Athabasca University Press make open access work? Athabasca University Press has a business model that derives its budget from a combination of institutional funding, grants, and sales revenue. It makes every work it publishes available for free online, while at the same time offering traditional print copies for sale. AUP published eighteen books in its first year, seventeen in its second, and anticipates publishing twenty to twenty five new titles in 2010/2011. Hildebrandt estimates that its maximum output would be around thirty to thirty five titles per year, making it a mid-sized press comparable to Wilfrid Laurier University Press. It also publishes seven online OA journals, one of which is also available in a print subscription. In addition, AUP lends its imprint to peer-reviewed website publications – sites that have, like scholarly monographs, been through an assessment process to determine the scholarly impact and validity of the material. Distribution and academic marketing of AUP’s printed books is done through the University of British Columbia Press, provides marketing and distribution services for the print books in Canada and internationally via its network of distributors in the US, Europe and Asia. The press employs nine people – eight full-time and one part-time – and contracts out most of its copyediting and design work.

The funding model for AUP likely differs from that of the rest of the Canadian university presses at present insofar as it has been initially nearly fully supported by its host university. According to Hildebrandt, the university currently supports the cost of bringing each title to the point of online publication. The cost of print publication must be recouped by sales and/or grants. The university

has committed to subsidizing the press in this way for at least three years, until AUP qualifies for Canadian Book Fund (formerly known as BPIDP funding) from the Department of Canadian Heritage. The press also pursues any traditional funding that is available to it, including ASPP grants from CFHSS, Canada Council funding, and funding from the Alberta Council for the Arts.

AUP author contracts have a copyright clause based on a Creative Commons attribution, non-commercial, no derivatives licence, which allows the free distribution of a work for non-commercial purposes with no changing of the original work, provided the author is properly cited. The OA work is distributed on the press's website in PDF form, both as a whole work and in chapter form. Additionally, the website provides librarians with MARC records for the book directly from the book's website. Print copies are produced in short offset runs, such that the minimum print run requirements for funding are met. The press will often overrun covers on the initial print run so that subsequent print runs, should they be necessary, can be done on a POD basis. People wishing to purchase a printed copy of the book are able to do so by linking through from the AUP site to UBC Press's site, where they can place their order. The press also produces value-added e-books (enhanced PDFs and epub files), which are mostly sold to libraries in bundles through the various aggregators that AUP works with. AU Press also produces and distributes podcasts and interviews with authors to accompany their OA books.

Marketing of AUP books is done in the traditional manner. UBC Press takes on some of the academic course marketing, while trade marketing is done in-house at AUP. Marketing campaigns are based on the print books only, and don't reference the OA availability of the title. Kathy Killoh, Journals and Digital Coordinator at AUP, notes that while marketing campaigns for the book titles do not advertise the OA versions in order to protect print sales, marketing for the press itself does publicize the OA model.

So far, Hildebrandt says, the results have been encouraging. Where he initially did have to do some "selling" of OA to prospective authors, he now finds that authors are seeking him out because they want their work to be published as open access. "Authors are saying that they would rather have their material read" says Hildebrandt. He notes that this may be due partially to the low royalties that most authors expect to receive on their books, but also that what is important to the scholars he talks to is that their work gets out to a reading public. Additionally, OA can result in increased citations of an author's scholarship, which are in turn interpreted by deans and tenure committees as evidence of the importance of the work to the scholarly community. While he didn't release any specific sales figures, AUP's director says that the anecdotal evidence he has seems to show that print book sales are remaining fairly solid, especially for trade and quasi-trade titles. Librarians are continuing to order print versions for their collections, even though the e-books are readily available for download on the AUP site. There is also evidence that course adoptions of AUP titles continue to sell print books, even when students are aware that free versions are available online. Since Athabasca UP has offered open access to its titles since its inception, it is impossible to compare how the titles might have fared in the commercial market in a print-only format. That said, it is Hildebrandt's opinion that OA seems to be driving sales rather than taking away from them. "Print and digital seem to be surviving in a robust way, maybe for

different reasons,” he says. “No one would have predicted that print would survive as robustly as it has.”¹⁰²

Even with his positive experience of OA, however, Hildebrandt cautions against the notion that OA scholarly publishing is a free-for-all that can be undertaken by anyone anywhere with access to a computer and the internet. Publishers add significant expertise to the publishing process and it would be a shame to lose that expertise. At a recent OA conference he attended in Sweden, Hildebrandt noted that a number of European universities had allocated publishing functions to their libraries. But librarians operate from a different mandate than publishers. Their goal is often to get as much information out to researchers as possible, with the quality of that information being a lower priority. Scholarly publishers, by contrast, are concerned with getting the best information possible out to researchers and in order to do that, they have established procedures and cultivated the necessary skill to ensure the quality of the books they produce. To demonstrate his point, Hildebrandt recounted an incident that occurred at the conference when a librarian at one of these library-publisher institutions was asked if he had any expertise in the peer review of scholarly works, to which the librarian had to admit he did not. In Hildebrandt’s view, open access is important to lower the barriers to knowledge, but not at any cost. There needs to be a hybrid model between the one showcased at the Swedish conference and the commercial one used by most university presses today. Scholarly publishing needs to make the best of both worlds by saving the expertise while also making research accessible.

Athabasca University Press’s future plans, like that of other presses, will undoubtedly depend on the directions that the economy, policy, and technology take, but Hildebrandt foresees a possible expansion of the press’s website publishing arm. Currently, the press has two website publications online (The Canadian Theatre Encyclopedia, available at <http://www.canadiantheatre.com>, and AURORA: Interviews with Leading Thinkers and Writers, available at <http://aurora.icaap.org>), and one more in the pipes. The AUP imprint is given to these sites after they have passed a review process that is similar to a journal assessment. While the site’s authors are free to add and modify content, an editorial board monitors the content. The ultimate goal of these projects, which do not have a built-in revenue stream attached to them at present, is to tackle the problem of knowledge integrity on the internet.

The press is also involved with John Willinsky’s Public Knowledge Project (PKP). A user of the PKP’s Open Journal Software (OJS), AUP is currently serving as the workflow model for monograph publishing in the PKP’s latest project, Open Monograph Press (OMP), after approaching PKP with their desire to have an OJS-like system that addressed the specific needs of book publishers. Currently still in the development stage, the first release of OMP is not going to be e-book publishing software. Rather, it will facilitate the production of a ready-to-publish file. Killoh anticipates that a future release will be actual online publishing software that will incorporate an incubation stage, a sort of informal interactive peer-review arena, where authors can get feedback from colleagues on their manuscripts before submitting them for publication. More information on the Open Monograph Press is available on the PKP website at <http://pkp.sfu.ca/omp>.

The press will also likely move towards electronic-only OA titles in the future, that is, titles which will only be published digitally, using a funding model in which the required subvention may be less than that necessary to publish a printed edition. When asked about whether the press had discussed different funding models for such titles with major funding bodies, such as the ASPP, Hildebrandt said he had not, but that he could envision differential subsidy figures, based on whether a book was printed or distributed online only. Author-pays models, such as the ones being used by commercial journal publishers, may be in the cards, but as yet, AUP has no formal policy on future funding. “We’re going to have to be creative about funding,” says Hildebrandt. As the first university press on the block to go fully OA, he no doubt will, and his creativity may provide models for other university presses wishing to travel the same road.

Open Access and Other Canadian University Presses

While Athabasca University Press may be the first Canadian press to embrace the uncharted territory of OA, other Canadian university presses are decidedly more cautious. Not all presses responded to a request for information on their experiences with open access, but of those who did, only two reported that they had published any OA titles. The University of Alberta Press (UAP) worked with Athabasca UP to publish two OA books. In this arrangement, UAP published the print version, while AUP published the OA version online. Linda Cameron, the director of UAP, reported that while she was unaware of the number of times those titles were downloaded from the AUP site, “the sales of the print editions seem to be as expected, neither higher nor lower than we would have forecasted.”¹⁰³ The only other press to report experience with OA was Wilfrid Laurier UP (WLUP), which has published approximately fifteen titles in OA form. All of these have been published in partnership with other organizations. In one case, the press worked with the Centre for International Governance Innovation, which makes the books freely available on its website a year after publication. Brian Henderson, WLUP’s director, says that sales of those books “are not great, in part because CIGI buys back 300 copies from us and hands them out for free too.”¹⁰⁴ Henderson notes that despite lacklustre sales, the arrangement with CIGI ensures that the press still makes a profit on the book. The last two books in the international governance series have been published in partnership with IDRC, which releases the books for free upon publication. Henderson acknowledges that it is still “early days” with respect to these two books, but “for the series as a whole we can say there has been no positive effect.”¹⁰⁵

The University of Calgary Press has indicated that they are on their way to OA, with plans to move to an OA model in the next two years. To facilitate this, they are reworking author contracts to permit OA distribution, and are asking authors to sign a Creative Commons licence. Donna Livingstone, the press’s director, foresees that OA titles will likely be simple PDFs, while e-books, which would be sold to libraries, would include “library-attractive features,” such as MARC records. While the press doesn’t have any first-hand evidence to go on, it expects that sales of both print and e-books will be negatively affected by the release of titles on an OA basis. For Livingstone, as for Hildebrandt, the only way to make OA work is to “change our paradigm and the way we measure our success. Scholarly research shouldn’t be measured by sales – it should be measured by the reach and impact we make.”¹⁰⁶ Perhaps to that end, one of the initiatives that the press is eager to take on is the open access release of their African studies series, which will make that research freely available in the countries where it is most relevant. The University of Calgary Press, unlike other ACUP presses, is part of the library at the university, and from Livingstone’s perspective, scholarly publishing is shifting towards becoming the more broad scholarly communication, in which digitization and institutional repositories are considered forms of publishing as much as the traditional print book is. The U of C Press is encouraged in its OA goals, as it has found that several young authors have expressed an interest in publishing with the press because of its openness to open access.

The publishers who had not yet released any books in OA largely gave variations on the same response: they rely on sales of printed monographs to recover the full costs of publication and to

contribute to overhead. Some indicated that unless there was additional funding made available, they would not be attempting OA. One press director indicated that there was no demand for OA from his constituency, while another indicated that he had not yet had the time to assess the possible impacts of OA on his press's operations. The point was also made that, unlike journals, most monographs are only starting to find their markets after a year, so a year-long embargo period, the period frequently cited in OA journal literature, is insufficient time for monograph publishers to retain their necessary sales revenues. In addition, one publisher noted that their authors still prefer printed books, as they are still seen as more valuable to tenure committees.

In many ways, the current situation in Canada with respect to open access is a bit of waiting game, as stakeholders watch to see what new developments – in technology, funding, university governance, advocacy, etc – take place. What most can now agree on, however, is that open access isn't going to go away. It may have found an initial broad audience as a result of the serials pricing crisis in libraries, but it now finds supporters in areas quite unconcerned with the cost of medical journal subscriptions in a university library. OA advocates support it for many different reasons, including facilitating access to knowledge to underdeveloped nations, the belief that knowledge should always be free, the conviction that if taxpayers fund research and publishing, then they should have access to it at no cost. In the face of this advocacy, those who work in the knowledge dissemination business have concerns about the long-term financial viability of OA models, and wonder what the effects of OA in scholarly publishing will be on both the publishers themselves, and the type of scholarship they have become expert at shepherding into the world. While nobody has a crystal ball to determine what shape the industry will ultimately take, Canadian scholarly presses are aware that it is changing, and that the best way to meet those changes is to be informed. The goal of the next section is to examine some business models that might be of use as we strive to meet our responsibilities as chaperones of some of the best scholarship that Canada has to offer, while also fulfilling our current fiscal obligations to our universities, funders, and staff.

IV. Possible Business Models and Future Considerations

One of the key concerns of publishers in this brave new world of open access is sustainability. How can Canadian scholarly publishers sustain current operations and safeguard the viability of the industry while still addressing the goals of the OA movement? The following models may provide some guidance to presses considering open access for some or all of their titles. Readers are asked to bear in mind that this report is not endorsing any one of these models; it will be up to individual publishers to determine whether or if any of the scenarios below make sense given the specificities of their unique press. Many of these models are currently being used in some aspect of the scholarly publishing world in either in journals or monographs. Several have been adapted from Ithaka's 2008 report, "Sustainability and Revenue Models for Online Academic Resources," a useful document that examines why sustainability is such a salient and problematic issue for online academic resources.¹⁰⁷ Others have been drawn from *The Long Tail* author Chris Anderson's most recent book *Free: The Future of a Radical Price*, which presents a compelling history and theory of product pricing and promotion in the digital age.¹⁰⁸ None of these models needs to stand alone; presses may wish to consider using a combination of models depending on their needs and resources.

1. Author-Pays Model¹⁰⁹

Description:

In this model, borrowed from the author-pays model used by several of the STM commercial journal publishers, publishers seek to recoup what is lost from print sales from an author fee that covers this amount. Estimates of the actual amount that this might be vary from \$5,000 to \$7,000,¹¹⁰ to upwards of \$34,000 (including overhead allocation).¹¹¹ Actual figures would need to account for whether or not funders who have traditionally given grant monies for printed titles decide to fund OA titles to the same degree. An "add-on" to this model, which might be considered as an add-on to other models as well, comes from Greco and Wharton, who suggest charging submission fees to prospective authors, both for the initial manuscript assessment and then, once the manuscript is deemed ready for peer review, as a fee to cover the peer review process.¹¹²

Possible Advantages:

- Eliminates the financial risk to publishers of decreasing sales revenues due to free access to their titles.
- Content can be made available for free to anyone who can download it, with no access restrictions (and therefore less programming).

Possible Disadvantages:

- Cost to author may be prohibitive, particularly to young scholars, which may have a trickle-down effect on tenure committees, if worthy scholarship was not published due to the inability of individual authors to afford author fees.
- The author-pays model may give the appearance of vanity publishing.
- While the model may allow for OA to the title, thus lifting the financial barriers to access, the author fee may create barriers on the contributor side which will deter authors from publishing with presses who charge these kinds of fees.

Other considerations:

- Why is the press considering offering OA titles? If it is a matter of “personal” ideology, with little buy-in from constituents, charging author fees for OA is likely to be highly unpopular and would not result in any net benefit to the press in terms of reputation or author loyalty.
- Are any other competing publishers contemplating or using this model? Very few publishers would want to be the first in the pack to be initiating these charges, especially if the charges fell into the higher range of the aforementioned estimates.

2. Institutional Subsidies Model¹³**Description:**

In this model, presses would negotiate higher institutional subsidies in order to offer titles on an open access basis. This may be a persuasive model for presses whose host institutions are moving more towards OA in their faculty research and library policies.

Possible Advantages:

- Open access could be rolled out slowly without financial risk to the press’s bottom line.
- May foster closer relations between the press and university administration.
- Avoids the pitfalls of the author-pays model while still financing risk-free experimentation with OA.
- A closer relationship with university administration may lead to other non-financial resources being allocated to the press, such as research assistant/work-study student hours, office space, or technological infrastructure.

Possible Disadvantages:

- University administration may wish the press to serve as a faculty publisher in exchange for the subsidy, thus favouring, or perhaps even mandating, the funding of university-faculty-authored scholarship only.
- For those presses who are comfortably operating at arm’s length from their administrations, a closer relationship may jeopardize the press’s sense of independence.
- Institutional subsidies may not be guaranteed, should the institution’s mission or leadership change.

Other Considerations:

- Does the university have the means to allocate more funding to the press in support of OA? What is the university’s mission with respect to open access?
- What has the history of the relationship between the press and its host institution been? This may have a bearing on whether or not it is desirable or feasible to consider asking for subsidy monies.
- Who is in charge of making these kinds of budgetary decisions and what is their commitment to the press?
- Does the university’s development program raise funds for special projects? If so, it may be worth discussing the possibility of fundraising for OA with university administration as this might be a way to increase the press’s funding while also publicizing the university’s concern for access to research to its alumni and donors.

3. Third-Party Funding Model¹¹⁴

Description:

Not unlike sponsored series, third-party funding for OA would involve grants from individuals, foundations, or corporations with the specific purpose of making university press titles freely accessible. It is unlikely that any one individual donor could, or would wish to, fund open access for an entire list, so this model may work best for presses wishing to experiment with OA on specific titles while minimizing their financial risk. Donors might be acknowledged both on the website at the point of download, or/as well as in the printed book.

Possible Advantages:

- This model would allow experimentation with OA on a small scale with minimal financial risk to the publisher.
- It may not be that difficult to find donors who are willing to sponsor OA for a single title, especially if this is done in conjunction with the university's development office.
- Having one or two OA titles funded by a third party may lead to a beneficial ongoing relationship with that third party, or it may entice other parties to make similar donations.

Possible Disadvantages:

- Could lead to negative perceptions as to the impartiality of the published work, especially if the donor is a corporation with a vested interest in the subject matter.
- May require ongoing fundraising and marketing to maintain relationships and find new funders.

Other Considerations:

- Will your host university be supportive of your fundraising initiatives? Is there a possibility that the institution may be concerned that such fundraising will funnel away donations from the university itself?
- Will your host university devote fundraising staff/time to this project, or will the press staff have to be responsible for finding donors? If the latter, is there anyone on staff who would be good at this kind of fundraising? Do they have the time to do this on an ongoing basis? How much would it cost to have the person use her/his time in this pursuit and how likely is it that the person would be successful? Are there any precedents in your university or other departments that might serve as models?
- Will the third-party wish to have any editorial input on the work that will be made available?
- Is the donor a party that the press wishes to be associated with?

4. Freemium Model¹¹⁵

Description:

“Freemium” is a term coined by venture capitalist Fred Wilson, and is used to denote a sales model in which at least two versions exist of an online product or service: a premium version and a basic version. Users pay for the premium version, while the basic version is free to whoever wants it. According to Chris Anderson, freemium works because “[a] typical online site follows the 5 Percent Rule – 5 percent of users support all the rest. In the freemium model, that means for every user who pays for the premium version ... nineteen others get the basic free version. The reason this works is that the cost of serving the nineteen is close enough to zero to call it

nothing.”¹¹⁶ A freemium model applied to open access monographs might charge users for a value-added e-book (for example, an enhanced PDF, an epub file, access to additional content, hyperlinked citations, etc.) while offering a basic text version of the book for free.

Possible Advantages:

- Most publishers already prepare files as web-ready PDFs for library aggregators and epub is open source so preparing files in this manner should not be costly.
- Depending on how basic the basic model is, customers may opt to purchase the premium version after downloading/accessing the basic model.

Possible Disadvantages:

- There is no guarantee that sales of the premium version will recoup all the costs of publication.
- Again, depending on how basic the basic model is, OA advocates may see it as sabotaging OA, or as doing the bare minimum to satisfy OA demands.
- There may be more technological considerations in creating value-added files. Moreover, what is considered value-added will likely change as technology changes, thus requiring ongoing technological expertise to keep up.

Other considerations:

- What novel kinds of value-added features are possible with the books you are considering for OA? Value-added features may vary from title to title, depending on the audience and subject matter.
- Is your core audience the type who will buy value-added books? Will they buy printed books at a higher price rather than take the time to download a digital copy and read it on-screen/print it out on their own? If they are the former type, then your value-added product may simply be the printed book, priced at a high enough level such that it subsidizes the OA release of the same title.

5. *Three-Party (aka Two-Sided) Market Model*¹¹⁷

Description:

This is the business model that underlies advertising in the media: “a third party pays to participate in a market created by a free exchange between the first two parties”¹¹⁸ For example, radio is free to listeners because advertisers have paid to have those same listeners listen to their ads. At first glance, this model may not make much sense when it comes to scholarly monographs. However, when one considers that major library associations have been vocal advocates of open access for citizens, a case might be made that OA to monographs could be free if libraries are willing to pay to spread their message of OA to book readers. In this case, publishers would charge libraries a fee for online access to the books, while everyone else gets it free. In many ways, this model is simply another version of the institutional subsidies or third-party subsidies model, but it proposes targeting a class of purchasers (libraries) rather than individual entities.

Possible Advantages:

- There is no need to have different digital versions of your books available, which cuts down on technology costs.

- If a deal could be reached with library consortia to agree to this model, then revenues might be more stable than in some of the other possible business models.

Possible Disadvantages:

- It may be difficult, if not impossible, to monitor whether libraries that haven't paid are including the OA versions of the books in their catalogues. The system would have to work on an honour principle.
- May require significant negotiation with libraries to get their buy-in to such a model.
- There are likely to be highly complex negotiations involved in negotiating international library fees for the use of works published by Canadian presses.

Other considerations:

- How many libraries can your press count on to purchase most, if not all, of your titles?
- Are there other institutions, apart from libraries, that may be suitable alternatives to subsidize OA in this fashion?

6. Hybrid Model

Description:

Aka., the mixed bag, this model is the most common model for OA publishing in academic presses at present. The hybrid model involves making titles freely accessible online, with printed copies available on a POD basis. The publisher (or author) retains a non-commercial, no distribution Creative Commons licence for the work, which will still allow the collection of licensing rights for chapter reprints and excerpts used in other works and in course packs. This is essentially the model used by both Bloomsbury Academic and Rice University Press. Athabasca University Press also uses this model, but does traditional print runs for its books, rather than one-off POD books.

Possible Advantages:

- Requires no changes in the way that books are produced.
- Press is not responsible for holding inventory, since the books are printed on demand as needed. The POD process can be simplified by sending the print customer directly to the printer's site to order the book. This would require interfacing between the press and the printer, but it will greatly reduce time spent managing single orders. An example of this arrangement can be found by clicking the "Buy Now" link on any book page on the Rice University Press website at <http://rup.rice.edu/>.
- As this method is being more widely used than some of the others, it may be possible to get information on its successes and challenges from presses who are using it.

Possible Disadvantages:

- No guarantee that sales of the printed book and reprint licences will make enough money to cover the costs of production.
- The POD arrangement might require both technical and financial negotiation with the printer, since if the press hopes to make a profit on the printed book, a markup on the printer's prices would have to be incorporated. If the printer collects the money from the customer, then the printer will also have to return a certain portion of it back to the press, which could be complicated.

- Managing returns of books would be highly complex, particularly if warehousing facilities are eliminated. Without warehousing, returns would likely be pulped, only to be reprinted when subsequent orders come in.

Other Considerations:

- What are some ways the press can enhance the user experience on the site? One of the growing areas on the web at present is interactivity in the form of comment feeds, discussion areas, multimedia presentations, audio and video files etc. These may be one way to drive loyal traffic to the press’s website, and therefore make more sales while also publicizing the press and its list. On the other hand, addition of this content may have costs in time and labour that must be accounted for.

7. Embargo Model

Description:

This is a common method of offering open access to research in the journal world and involves releasing the research for free on the publisher’s website after a certain amount of time. In the STM journal world, that period is generally between 0 and 12 months following publication, however, this period may need to be longer for research in the social sciences and humanities.¹¹⁹ The embargo period, during which time the book – either in print version or e-book version – is sold for a price, allows publishers to recoup their investment costs before the research is released in OA form.

Possible Advantages:

- Requires no changes in the way books are currently produced.
- Allows presses to budget more predictably for sales revenue over the embargo period (in comparison with the hybrid model, where there is currently no way of predicting how many people will choose to buy the print copy of a book when it is also available for free.

Possible Disadvantages:

- OA advocates may not consider this true open access, and funders pushing for OA may agree.
- After the embargo period ends, course book sales would likely also be drastically and precipitously impacted, which would have a significant impact on profitability.

Other Considerations:

- What might be the minimum embargo period the press would need to break-even or be profitable on most titles?
- Might there be increased marketing activities or new publicity initiatives that might drive more sales in the period directly following publication that would allow the shortening of the embargo period?

8. Advertising Model

Description:

This model is best suited as an add-on to other models, as few university presses have the site traffic to generate significant revenues. Advertising alone will never be able to fully fund OA. Nonetheless, as the 2008 Ithaka report notes, advertising “has become by far the most prevalent business model for commercial content providers on the web, and certainly for those that are open

to the public”¹²⁰ Publishers register their sites with ad networks like Google’s AdSense which then serve up ads based on keywords and site subject matter.

Possible Advantages:

- Additional ongoing revenue with little to no investment of effort.
- Advertising, even on small websites, blogs, and non-profit sites, is becoming commonplace, and there is reason to believe that more and more advertisers will be spending more money on online advertising in the near future.¹²¹

Possible Disadvantages:

- Could give the impression that the press’s research publications are sponsored by the advertisers appearing on the site.
- May give an unprofessional feel to the website.
- May be prohibited by funders guidelines in some instances.

Other Considerations:

- There may be ad companies that specialize in academic or non-profit advertising, such as recruitment ads for universities, grad schools, etc, that may be more relevant and less commercial than traditional online advertising.
- Even if advertising is not generally appropriate for the whole of the press’s website, it may be more acceptable in certain ancillary sections, for example comment areas, video or audio link pages, etc.

9. Collaborative Model

Description:

In this model, the press would collaborate with another institution or department – usually the university library – to share resources in a way that would make OA financially feasible. This model often involves budget-sharing between departments and a clear delineation of responsibilities based on each party’s areas of expertise. An example of this model is the University of California Press’s collaboration with the California Digital Library to offer “a suite of open access digital and print publication services to University of California centers, institutes, and departments that produce scholarly books.”¹²² This collaboration takes advantage of the California Digital Library’s expertise in OA via their eScholarship platform with the University of California Press’s commercial distribution and marketing experience to make OA of University of California research more accessible (through OA) while still financially viable (through resource sharing).

Possible Advantages:

- The model doesn’t involve reinventing the proverbial wheel. The press performs the publishing functions that it has expertise in, while the library contributes its expertise in online dissemination.
- Opportunity to build closer ties with the university library, which could lead to future fruitful collaborations.
- The press might save money.

Possible Disadvantages:

- Should the model be successful on a longterm basis, the economies of resource sharing may make some staff members on both sides obsolete.

- It may be difficult to control which functions get allocated to the library and which go to the publisher.

Other Considerations:

- What sort of expertise in online OA publishing/dissemination does your university library have?
- Are there other departments on campus or independent organizations with which your press might be able to develop a similar collaboration?

10. SCOAP³ Model

Description:

As described in an earlier section of this paper, SCOAP³ is a funding project by a consortium of stakeholders in advanced particle physics, wherein OA is facilitated by a reallocation of funds by the consortium from buying institutional subscriptions to journals in advanced particle physics to instead providing the funds to journals to offer their content on an OA basis. While the SCOAP³ model may not be suited to all subjects, there is no reason why it can't be recast to accommodate scholarly monographs in certain subject areas, or across subject areas. What might happen, for example, if all Canadian and perhaps American research libraries reallocated their monograph monies in Canadian studies to a fund that would instead go towards funding OA of those titles? This is an ambitious, organizational nightmare, perhaps, but not beyond the realm of possibility.

Possible Advantages:

- Would allow university presses to provide OA to titles while maintaining sustainability.
- Might build new direct relationships with libraries.
- Would allow all university presses publishing in certain areas to offer OA in those areas, thereby promoting OA across the board and not just at certain UPs with the financial resources to cover it.

Possible Disadvantages:

- Would require immense organizational effort to launch such a project.
- Would need a thorough financial evaluation to ascertain if sustainability would be viable under such a model.
- If individual funders decided to back out of the deal, financial instability could easily be created for university presses.

Other Considerations:

- What, if any, areas that Canadian UPs publish in might be suitable to this type of arrangement?
- Who would determine how the pool of money would be allocated to various presses that publish in a particular subject? How might this determination process affect what gets published and by whom?
- Do the relationships required to initiate such an arrangement currently exist? If not, how might we go about fostering them? If they do, who would take responsibility for getting the ball rolling?
- How might this affect university press arrangements with library wholesalers and e-book aggregators? Are there contractual obligations that would preclude participation in such an arrangement?

11. Complete Restructuring

Description:

Not so much a business model as an industry model, complete restructuring would involve the reorganization of the scholarly publishing industry at a much grander scale. As this report has noted, both Europe and the United States have seen discussions – and in the case of the EC, mandates – on open access in scholarly publishing at a governmental level. As yet, such discussion has not emerged on the Canadian stage. A complete restructuring of the Canadian industry to accommodate and encourage open access to scholarly research as has been done in other countries would require the involvement of the federal government on a policy level.

Possible Advantages:

- New, creative approaches to fostering and funding open access may come out of high-level discussions.

Possible Disadvantages:

- Such restructuring may be both lengthy and cumbersome for publishers.
- Requires significant coordination at several levels: organization, institution, governmental, etc.

Other Considerations:

- Who should be involved in such a restructuring?

How might the organization of such restructuring discussions be facilitated?

12. Do Nothing

Description

This “model” would entail simply proceeding with business as usual. Publishers would not actively institute any new business models to accommodate open access, but would, of course, respond to overwhelming demand for it, should it arise, when the time comes.

Possible Advantages:

May enable certain publishers to learn from others’ experiences with open access without investing very much of their own resources and energy into responding to the issue.

Possible Disadvantages:

Risks leaving publishers unprepared, financially, technologically, and organizationally, for a sea change in the current market for scholarly monographs.

Doing nothing and simply responding to change instigated by other parties will leave publishers without input into the direction/form that open access can/should take with respect to scholarly publishing.

Waiting until the last minute to address or offer open access could result in a loss of readership and/or a decline in a publisher’s reputation among scholars.

Other Considerations:

Is it possible to experiment with open access for a limited number of titles, or even a single title, in such a way that does not overhaul the press’s entire operational structure, but allows the publisher to be prepared for how things might look if open access becomes the new “normal” as far as scholarly publishing is concerned?

Does the press have the necessary resources (staff and skills) to move quickly on open access when/if it becomes imperative?

These models are by no means exhaustive, and none of them will likely emerge as a panacea for OA in scholarly publishing. It is also important to note that virtually none of these models can be implemented by a university press on its own. There are funder guidelines to consider, libraries to work with, university administrators to consult, scholars to please, and authors to attract.

University presses do not operate in isolation from their partners in scholarly communication. A sea change such as the broad adoption of open access for research published in monograph form will require coordinated effort and goodwill from all parties. Canadian university presses are fully committed to the widest dissemination of scholarly work and thus the principles underlying open access but we need help if we are to make it a reality. Sustainability is our foremost concern, since without a solid business plan that assures us of solvency, we cannot embrace the financial risk of open access.

Looking Towards the Future

Much of this report has focused on the digital future of the Canadian scholarly publishing industry. Open access, almost by definition, requires that publications are available and distributed online. However, the death knell has not yet sounded for the printed book, and indeed, may never. The industry is still standing with one foot solidly in the print world because that is what scholars, researchers, librarians, and financial supporters still expect. Until that expectation disappears, Canadian university presses are obliged to continue to provide print options for the scholarship they publish. At the same time, they must keep abreast of developments in the online world of e-books, RSS feeds, social networking, OA, Kindles and Readers, iPads, and The Next Big Thing. One thing that the world has learned about the internet and its related technology over the past decade is that nothing stays still for very long. There are always new file formats to conform to, new mark-up languages to learn, new tags to update.

With respect to open access, then, publishers would be well advised to keep an eye on how advancing technology may work to disrupt, challenge, complement, or eradicate the best-laid of business plans. For example, a publisher adopting a freemium model to fund OA may find that the value-added features that made a certain title worth paying for are suddenly obsolete. On the other hand, a publisher who decides to sell epub versions of their titles, while offering flat text files or standard PDFs for free, may find themselves in just the right place should the recently announced iPad and iBook store become as ubiquitous as iPods and iPhones.

Those who would question the value of Canadian university presses going into the future would be well advised to remember that academia is its own ecosystem. Eradicating a key part of that ecosystem will have serious consequences on the remaining players – and none of us can know in advance what those consequences might be. University presses were created with the aim of publishing scholarly research whose market was too small to attract commercial publishers. As time went on, they evolved to become important arbiters of quality in academia, and as a result, came to play a key role in the tenure process that is so important to professional scholars. To continue their mandate of broad dissemination of research, university presses developed expertise in production, design, and marketing, such that the scholarship that found its home with UPs could be assured not only of the highest editorial quality, but also of a finished product comparable to that produced by trade and commercial publishers that found its way into the widest audience possible. To dispense with university presses would mean losing all of this hard-won expertise, only to have to replace it from scratch in the hands of librarians, academics, or whatever new intermediary rises up. Reinventing the wheel has never been a successful strategy. A much better one has always been to build on what has come before, through careful and considered strategies that retain the best of what has come before.

How scholarly monographs will be produced, read, and purchased in the future will probably always be unclear. What we can be assured of is that Canadian university presses will continue to strive to produce quality readable and important publications that advance and enhance scholarly research, and to do it in a way that ensures that this vital activity will survive for many years to come.

V. Conclusion

Canadian university presses are not uniform entities. Like the books they publish, each is unique, with its own unique blend of ideology, goals, resources, infrastructure, and personality. This paper has been written to provide a common starting point, from which further discussion can emerge. It has not resolved the problem of how best to offer open access for scholarly publishers, but it has provided background to the issue and identified key areas for future discussion. The sustainability of university presses in an open access world has certainly emerged as one of these, as has the necessity of collaborating with other stakeholders in the scholarly communication process, such as libraries, university administration, faculty members and researchers, and funders. Open access affects all of these entities and it is incumbent upon them to acknowledge that the actions of each one with respect to OA affects all the others. Donna Livingstone, the director of the University of Calgary Press, has said: “I don’t believe that scholarly presses can survive in isolation.”¹²³ If she is right, then the time has come to work together to facilitate open access to university-press-published works. Hopefully this paper has laid some of the groundwork necessary for that work to begin.

-
- 1 A note on terminology is necessary here. Throughout this paper, the terms “university presses,” “monograph publishers,” and “scholarly presses/publishers” are used interchangeably to designate not-for-profit academic publishers whose key business is the dissemination of scholarly research in monograph (rather than journal) form. In the context of this report, these terms do not include commercial publishers who may also produce scholarly monographs, but whose main business is the large-scale production of textbooks for the postsecondary market. Nor do they include trade publishing firms who may publish the occasional scholarly work that finds its way into both trade and academic settings.
 - 2 Open access as a concept has a longer history than this. As John Willinsky notes, OA emerged informally in the early 1990s, with the launching of physicist Paul Ginsparg’s pre-print service (now known as arXiv.org). Arguably, OA had its technological start as early as the 1980s with the release of free, open source software. See Willinsky 2006 and 2009.
 - 3 Budapest Open Access Initiative. Available online at <http://www.soros.org/openaccess/read.shtml>. Accessed 14 September 2009.
 - 4 Ibid.
 - 5 Guedon, J. 2004. The ‘Green’ and ‘Gold’ Roads to Open Access: The Case for Mixing and Matching. *Serials Review* 30: 315-328.
 - 6 Creative Commons. Available at <http://creativecommons.org/about/who-uses-cc/>. Accessed 7 November, 2009.
 - 7 OA article-processing fees are available on each publisher’s webpage. For more information on OA options available at BioMed Central, Springer, Elsevier, Wiley-Blackwell, Taylor and Francis, Sage, and Oxford Journals, see <http://www.biomedcentral.com/info/authors/apcfaq>, <http://www.springer.com/open+access?SGWID=0-169302-0-0-0>, http://www.elsevier.com/wps/find/intro.cws_home/sponsoredarticles, <http://authorservices.wiley.com/bauthor/CTA.asp>, <http://journalauthors.tandf.co.uk/beyondpublication/iopenaccess.asp>, <http://www.sagepub.com/sageopen.sp>, and <http://www.oxfordjournals.org/oxfordopen/charges.html>. All accessed 8 November, 2009.
 - 8 Richardson, cited in Willinsky 2009a.
 - 9 See Willinsky 2009a, Bernius et al. 2009, Houghton et al. 2009, Swan 2005, and Harnad et al. 2008, among others.
 - 10 Bernius et al. 2009
 - 11 Conley and Wooders 2009, p. 75.
 - 12 Additionally, the current scholarly publishing model devotes significant attention to the presentation

-
- of scholarly material, through both graphic design and typesetting, as well as careful copyediting and proofreading, that contributes immeasurably to the ultimate readability and accessibility of the final document.
- 13 Greco and Wharton 2008
 - 14 See Waltham 2009, available at <http://www.nhalliance.org/bm~doc/hssreport.pdf>. Accessed 12 January 2010.
 - 15 Similar figures for Canadian journals are not currently available.
 - 16 While this 2% figure is dwarfed by the revenues derived from sales, it is important to recognize that in an industry with as narrow margins as are the norm in scholarly publishing, even 2% can amount to a significant portion of income, particularly given that subrights sales carry no inventory costs.
 - 17 Greco and Wharton 2008. Figures derived from authors' Business Model Assumptions and Sample Profit and Loss Statement for a Hardbound University Press Book (p.157). Similar figures are cited in the AAUP Statement on Open Access, February 2007, available at <http://aaupnet.org/aboutup/issues/oa/statement.pdf>. Accessed 16 January 2010.
 - 18 See <http://www.ithaka.org/about-ithaka>, accessed 12 January 2010.
 - 19 Brown, Griffiths, and Rascoff 2007, p. 5.
 - 20 Ibid, p. 17.
 - 21 Ibid, p. 19.
 - 22 In 2009, JSTOR merged with Ithaka and is now considered a service of that organization (<http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/organization/missionHistory.jsp>).
 - 23 "International" in this paper will be limited to US and Europe, in part because the scholarly communication systems in these regions are very close to our own, and in part because of the difficulty of getting detailed information on OA and scholarly communications from other parts of world due to the author's language limitations.
 - 24 See Suber's Timeline of the Open Access Movement, available at <http://www.earlham.edu/~peters/fos/timeline.htm>. Accessed 16 January 2010.
 - 25 For a thorough history of OA developments in the US and internationally, see Peter Suber's nearly exhaustive blog on the subject, Open Access News, at <http://www.earlham.edu/~peters/fos/fosblog.html>. For Suber's fulsome writings on OA, see <http://www.earlham.edu/~peters/fos/oawritings.htm>. For a compendium of OA facts, see http://oad.simmons.edu/oadwiki/Main_Page. For the Open Access Tracking Project, a news alert service on OA, see http://oad.simmons.edu/oadwiki/OA_tracking_project.
 - 26 See Johnson 2004.
 - 27 "Final NIH Statement on Sharing Research Data," available at <http://grants.nih.gov/grants/guide/notice-files/NOT-OD-03-032.html>. Accessed 17 January 2010.
 - 28 See "NIH Public Access Policy Details", available at <http://publicaccess.nih.gov/policy.htm>. Accessed 17 January 2010.
 - 29 PLoS Mission and Goals, available at <http://www.plos.org/about/index.html>. Accessed 17 January 2010.
 - 30 "Science Publishing – beginning of a revolution," available at <http://www.biomedcentral.com/info/presscenter/pressreleases?pr=19990426>. Accessed 17 January 2010.
 - 31 See "Harvard goes Open Access" available at <http://cyber.law.harvard.edu/node/3462>. Accessed 17 January 2010.
 - 32 University of Alberta Press, Athabasca University Press, University of British Columbia Press, University of Calgary Press, University of Ottawa Press, University of Toronto Press, and Wilfrid Laurier University Press.
 - 33 See AAUP Statement on Open Access, available at <http://aaupnet.org/aboutup/issues/oa/statement.pdf>. Accessed 16 January 2010.
 - 34 Jensen 1999. Available at <http://www.nap.edu/staff/mjensen/aaup99.html>. Accessed 17 January 2010.
 - 35 These are: Ohio State University Press, University of Pittsburgh Press, Harvard University Press, Utah State University Press, Columbia University Press, Rice University Press, Yale University Press, MIT Press, University of California Press, Pennsylvania State University Press, University of Michigan Press, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign's Computers and Composition Digital Press, Miami University Press, University of Tennessee, Georgetown University

-
- 36 See “Google Checks Out Library Books,” available at http://www.google.com/press/pressrel/print_library.html. Accessed 17 January 2010.
- 37 Letter available on the AAUP website at http://www.aaupnet.org/aboutup/issues/0865_001.pdf. Accessed 17 January 2010.
- 38 See <http://publishers.org/main/Copyright/Google/Release.htm>. Accessed 17 January 2010.
- 39 See <http://www.authorsguild.org/advocacy/articles/settlement-resources.attachment/googles-answer-to-authors-guild/Google%27s%20Answer%20to%20Authors%20Guild%2011302005.pdf>. Accessed 17 January 2010.
- 40 See “The Revised Google Books Settlement Agreement,” available at <https://sites.google.com/a/pressatgoogle.com/googlebookssettlement/revised-settlement/SettlementModificationsOverview.pdf>. Accessed 18 January 2010.
- 41 See Johnson 2004.
- 42 Congressional Research Service Summary of H.R. 801: Fair Copyright in Research Works Act. Available at <http://www.govtrack.us/congress/bill.xpd?bill=h111-801&tab=summary>. Accessed 18 January 2010.
- 43 See Peter Suber’s Worst of 2008, available at <http://www.earlham.edu/~peters/fos/newsletter/01-02-09.htm#2008>. Accessed 20 January 2010.
- 44 See <http://www.aaupnet.org/aboutup/issues/letterFCRWA.pdf>, accessed 20 January 2010.
- 45 See Scholarly Publishing Roundtable 2010, p. i.
- 46 Ibid, p. ii.
- 47 Willinsky 2009c.
- 48 See “The Berlin Declaration on Open Access to Knowledge in the Sciences and Humanities,” available at <http://oa.mpg.de/openaccess-berlin/berlindeclaration.html>. Accessed 20 January 2010.
- 49 See “Commission study addresses Europe’s scientific publication system,” available at <http://europa.eu/rapid/pressReleasesAction.do?reference=IP/06/414&format>. Accessed 20 January 2010.
- 50 See “ERC Scientific Counsel Statement on Open Access, December 2006”, available at <http://erc.europa.eu/pdf/open-access.pdf>. Accessed 20 January 2010.
- 51 See “ERC Scientific Council Guidelines for Open Access, 17 December 2007”, available at http://erc.europa.eu/pdf/ScC_Guidelines_Open_Access_revised_Dec07_FINAL.pdf. Accessed 20 January 2010.
- 52 See “Council Conclusions on scientific information in the digital age: access, dissemination and preservation,” p. 3, available at http://www.consilium.europa.eu/ueDocs/cms_Data/docs/pressData/en/intm/97236.pdf. Accessed 20 January 2010.
- 53 Ibid, p. 5.
- 54 Ibid, p. 6.
- 55 Available at http://ec.europa.eu/research/science-society//document_library/pdf_06/open-access-handbook_en.pdf. Accessed 20 January 2010.
- 56 See “Open access pilot in FP7,” available at <http://ec.europa.eu/research/science-society/index.cfm?fuseaction=public.topic&id=1680>. Accessed 20 January 2010.
- 57 See “UK PubMed Central: an international initiative,” available at <http://ukpmc.ac.uk/ppmc-localhtml/about.html>. Accessed 21 January 2010.
- 58 See OpenDOAR listings for Europe, available at <http://www.opendoar.org/countrylist.php?cContinent=Europe>. Accessed 21 January 2010.
- 59 See “About SCOAP3,” available at <http://scoap3.org/about.html>. Accessed 21 January 2010.
- 60 European Commission 2008, p. 120. It should be noted, however, that the SCOAP³ model may be limited to certain kinds of publishing. Particle physics, for example, is a field where very few journals exist, with these journals being priced at the high end of the spectrum.
- 61 OECD 2005, p.14. Available at <http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/42/12/35393145.pdf>.
- 62 Houghton et al. 2009, pp. xxiv – xxv.
- 63 Ashling 2009, p. 22.
- 64 Ibid.
- 65 See the text of the joint statement, available at <http://publishers.org.uk/download.cfm?docid=2CFFA8AE-ADDF-4191-9F2EA377E72CA6DC>.

-
- Accessed 29 September 2009.
- 66 See OAPEN homepage, available at <http://www.oapen.org/>. Accessed 21 January 2010.
- 67 de Vries 2007, p. 199.
- 68 Ibid., p. 200.
- 69 Ibid.
- 70 See De Vries 2007.
- 71 See “Bloomsbury Publishing Launches Academic Imprint,” available at <http://www.bloomsburyacademic.com/news1.htm>. Accessed 20 January 2010.
- 72 See <http://www.bloomsburyacademic.com/platform.htm>. Accessed 20 January 2010.
- 73 Pinter 2008, p. 203.
- 74 Ibid., p. 206.
- 75 de Vries 2007, p. 197.
- 76 Pinter 2008, p. 206.
- 77 Based on searches of Ulrich’s Periodicals Index, which revealed 1437 scholarly/academic journals originating in Canada, and 19,548 originating in the United States.
- 78 As a point of comparison, as of 25 January 2010, a search of www.openaccess.org reveals 51 open archives in Canada, 366 in the US, and 753 in Europe (of which 168 originate in the UK).
- 79 See <http://www.erudit.org/apropos/info.html>, accessed 22 January 2010.
- 80 See “About Synergies,” available at <http://www.synergiescanada.org/page/about>. Accessed 23 January 2010.
- 81 See the “Publishers” page, available at <http://www.synergiescanada.org/page/publishers>. Accessed 23 January 2010.
- 82 See <http://pubmedcentralcanada.ca/ppmc-localhtml/about-faq.html>. Accessed 23 January 2010.
- 83 See “CIHR Policy on Access to Research Outputs,” available at <http://www.cihr-irsc.gc.ca/e/32005.html>. Accessed 23 January 2010.
- 84 According to ROARMAP, the Registry of Open Access Repository Material Archiving Policies, only nine research funders in Canada have an OA mandate for publications resulting from research they fund. These are: CIHR, the National Research Council, the Ontario Institute for Cancer Research, the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada (proposed mandate), the Canadian Breast Cancer Research Alliance, the Canadian Cancer Society, the Canadian Health Services Research Foundation, les [Fonds de la recherche en santé Québec](#), and the [Michael Smith Foundation for Health Research](#).
- 85 See “Open Access Research Policy,” available at <http://www.athabascau.ca/policy/research/openaccess.htm>. Accessed 23 January 2010.
- 86 See “Open Access Authors Fund,” available at <http://library.ucalgary.ca/services/for-faculty/open-access-authors-fund-0>. Accessed 23 January 2010.
- 87 CARL 2005a.
- 88 See “Canadian Library Association / Association Canadienne des bibliothèques Position Statement on Open Access for Canadian Libraries,” available at http://www.cla.ca/AM/Template.cfm?Section=Position_Statements&Template=/CM/ContentDisplay.cfm&ContentID=5306. Accessed 24 January 2010.
- 89 CARL 2005b, p. 11.
- 90 In a 2005 letter to Google, Peter Givler of the AAUP outlined how American university presses stay afloat: “Although our members are nonprofits and many of them receive an operating subsidy from their parent institutions, they still have payrolls to meet and bills to pay, and in 2003, the most recent year for which we have such data, total university support only averaged about 13% of their operating income. Virtually all the rest of the money required to cover costs and stay in business must come from the sale and licensing of their publications ...” (Givler 2005, p.2).
- 91 Available at <http://fedcan.ca/images/File/PDF/Open%20Access%20Position.pdf>. Accessed 26 January 2010.
- 92 From the author’s correspondence with Kel Morin-Parsons, 29 October 2009.
- 93 From the author’s correspondence with J.Craig McNaughton, 11 December 2009.
- 94 Ibid.
- 95 From author’s correspondence with Elizabeth Eve, 3 February 2010.
- 96 At the time of writing, a query is pending with the Department of Canadian Heritage on whether it

-
- has any future plans to incorporate OA into its funding structures.
- 97 Brown, Griffiths, and Rascoff 2007, p. 32.
- 98 Jaschik 2007.
- 99 See <http://rup.rice.edu/about/support?support=1>. Accessed 26 January 2010.
- 100 Walter Hildebrandt, Director of Athabasca University Press, in conversation with author.
- 101 Web 2.0, a term used to describe the “second generation” of the internet, is a somewhat indefinite term used to describe a set of technological, design, and user-based features that have emerged since the web became common in our everyday lives. In general, it refers to the use of the internet as a platform upon which other interactive applications are built. See “What is Web 2.0,” available at <http://oreilly.com/web2/archive/what-is-web-20.html>. Accessed 26 January 2010.
- 102 There is some evidence from the experience of the National Academies Press in the US that suggests that this has also been that press’s experience. A 2003 study funded by the Mellon Foundation found that even when a free PDF was available, more than half of the customers still opted to pay for the printed book (Kline Pope and Kannan 2003).
- 103 From email correspondence with Linda Cameron, 18 January 2010.
- 104 From email correspondence with Brian Henderson, 22 January 2010.
- 105 Ibid.
- 106 From email correspondence with Donna Livingstone, 27 January 2010.
- 107 Available for download at http://www.ithaka.org/ithaka-s-r/strategy/sca_ithaka_sustainability_report-final.pdf. Accessed 25 October 2009.
- 108 Anderson 2009.
- 109 Adapted from the “Contributor pays model” of the 2008 Ithaka report (Guthrie, Griffiths, and Maron 2008, pp. 33-34)
- 110 Unverified ballpark estimates given by Walter Hildebrandt in conversation, 26 January 2010.
- 111 Estimate based on UBC Press per title costs for the fiscal year 2007/2008.
- 112 Greco and Wharton 2008.
- 113 Adapted from “Host institutional funds/in-kind contributions” section of the 2008 Ithaka report (Guthrie, Griffiths, and Maron 2008, pp. 36-37)
- 114 Adapted from “Corporate Sponsorships” section of the 2008 Ithaka report (Guthrie, Griffiths, and Maron 2008, pp. 38-39)
- 115 Adapted from Chris Anderson’s *Free: The Future of a Radical Price* (Anderson 2009).
- 116 Anderson 2009, p. 27.
- 117 Adapted from Chris Anderson’s *Free: The Future of a Radical Price* (Anderson 2009).
- 118 Ibid., p. 24.
- 119 See Scholarly Publishing Roundtable 2010, p. 12.
- 120 Guthrie, Griffiths, and Maron 2008, p. 40.
- 121 Ibid.
- 122 See “New Publishing Opportunity at the University of California” Press Release, available at http://www.ucpress.edu/press/pr/UCPubS_pressrelease.pdf. Accessed 27 January 2010.
- 123 Email correspondence with Donna Livingstone, 27 January 2010.

Bibliography

- Albanese, Andrew Richard. 2007. Scan this book! *Library Journal* 132 (13): 32-5.
- . 2006. Open access may heat up in 2006. *Library Journal* 131 (2): 18-9.
- Albert, Karen M. 2006. Open access: implications for scholarly publishing and medical libraries. *Journal of the Medical Library Association* 94 (3): 253-262.
- Anderson, Chris. 2009. *Free: The Future of a Radical Price*. New York: Hyperion.
- Anderson, Rick. 2007. Open access: clear benefits, hidden costs. *Learned Publishing* 20 (2): 83-4.
- Anscombe, Nadya. 2007. Open-access debate gets personal. *Research Information* 32: 11-2.
- Ashling, Jim. 2009. Report examines costs of OA publishing. *Information Today* 26 (4): 22-3.
- . 2007. Brussels 2007: The OA debate rages on. *Information Today* 24 (4): 28-9.
- Bailey, Charles W., Jr. 2005. *Open Access Bibliography: Liberating Scholarly Literature with E-Prints and Open Access Journals*. Washington, DC: Association of Research Libraries.
- Bankier, J. G., and I. Perciali. 2008. The institutional repository rediscovered: What can a university do for open access publishing? *Serials Review* 34 (1): 21-6.
- Bazerman, C., D. Blakesley, M. Palmquist, and D. Russell. 2008. Open access book publishing in writing studies: A case study. *First Monday* 13 (1): 1.
- Bazerman, Charles, David Blakesley, Mike Palmquist, and David Russell. 2008. Open access book publishing in writing studies: A case study. *First Monday (Online)* 13 (1).
- Belliston, C. Jeffrey. 2009. Open educational resources: Creating the instruction commons. *College & Research Libraries News* 70 (5): 284-303.
- Bernius, Steffen, Matthias Hanauske, Wolfgang Konig, and Berndt Dugall. 2009. Open access models and their implications for the players on the scientific publishing market. *Economic Analysis and Policy* 39 (1): 103-15.
- Bjork, Bo-Christer, and Turid Hedlund. 2009. Two scenarios for how scholarly publishers could change their business model to open access. *JEP: The Journal of Electronic Publishing* 12 (1).
- Borgman, Christine L. (1). 2008. Data, disciplines, and scholarly publishing. *Learned Publishing* 21 (1): 29-38.
- Brazzeal, Bradley, and T. Scott Plutchak. 2008. Conference report: After the E-journal: Now it really gets interesting. *The Serials Librarian* 53 (4): 177-83.
- Brown, David. 2009. Does open access really pay? *Library + Information Update* (May): 24-6.
- Brown, Laura, Rebecca Griffiths, and Matthew Rascoff. 2007. University Publishing In A Digital Age. Available at <http://www.ithaka.org/ithaka-s-r/strategy/Ithaka%20University%20Publishing%20Report.pdf>. Accessed 1 October 2009.

-
- Burchardt, Jorgen. 2008. Barriers to open access. *DF Revy* 31 (7): 4-7.
- Butler, Declan. 2008. PLoS stays afloat with bulk publishing. *Nature* 454: 11.
- Caldwell, Tracey. 2008. OA in the humanities badlands. *Information World Review* 247: 14-16.
- Candee, Catherine H. 2007. The University of California as Publisher. *ARL: A Bimonthly Report on Research Library Issues and Actions from ARL, CNI, and SPARC* 252/253: 10-11.
- Canadian Association of Research Libraries (CARL). 2005a. Brief to the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council: Open Access. Available at http://www.carl-abrc.ca/projects/open_access/sshrc_oa_consultn_brief.pdf. Accessed 24 January 2010.
- . 2005b. *Towards an Integrated Knowledge Ecosystem: A Canadian Research Strategy*. Available at http://www.carl-abrc.ca/projects/kdstudy/public_html/2005/finalreport.pdf. Accessed 18 September 2009.
- Cavaleri, Piero, Michael Keren, Giovanni B. Ramello, and Vittorio Valli. 2009. Publishing an E-journal on a shoe string: Is it a sustainable project? *Economic Analysis and Policy* 39 (1): 89-101.
- Chillingworth, Mark. 2005. OUP opens up author choice. *Information World Review* 214: 7.
- Churchill, Elizabeth F. 2008. Open, closed, or ajar? Content access and interactions. *Interactions* 15 (5): 42.
- Cockerill, Matthew. 2009. Establishing a central open access fund. *OCLC Systems & Services: International Digital Library Perspectives* 25 (1): 43-6.
- . 2008. Why have a central open access fund? *Library & Information Update* 7(3): 30.
- Conley, John P., and Myrna Wooders. 2009. But what have you done for me lately? Commercial publishing, scholarly communication, and open-access. *Economic Analysis and Policy* 39 (1): 71-87.
- Corbett, Hillary. 2009. The crisis in scholarly communication, part I: Understanding the issues and engaging your faculty. *Technical Services Quarterly* 26 (2): 125-34.
- Corbyn, Zoe. 2009. Publisher 'threat to open access. *Times Higher Education* (1901): 13(1)-14.
- Crawford, Walt. 2008. Open access: It's never simple. *Online* 32 (4): 58-1.
- Dames, K. Matthew. 2008. Oregon: A clash between copyright and open access. *Information Today* 25 (9): 21.
- Davis, Philip M. 2009. How the media frames "open access". *JEP: The Journal of Electronic Publishing* 12 (1).
- Dawson, Heather. 2007. Libraries and open access scholarship: ALISS conference. *ALISS Quarterly* 2 (3): 2-5.
- Devakos, Rea. 2007. Synergies: Building National Infrastructure for Canadian Scholarly Publishing. *ARL: A Bimonthly Report on Research Library Issues and Actions from ARL, CNI, and SPARC* 252/253: 16-19.
- De Vries, S. C. J. 2007. From sailing boat to steamship: The role of the publisher in an open

-
- access environment. *Learned Publishing* 20 (3): 196-201.
- Dillon, Cy. 2008. More access, more impact: Updates on the open access movement from Peter Suber and Jonathan Band. *Virginia Libraries* 54 (2): 7-347.
- Drake, Miriam A. 2007. Open access: The yellow brick road, its walls, and speed bumps. *Searcher* 15 (7): 51-4.
- . 2007. Scholarly communication in turmoil. *Information Today* 24, (2) (February): 1-19.
- Dudman, Jane. 2007. In the eye of the OA storm. *Information World Review*, no. 235, Pp. 20-22 (235) (May): 20-2.
- Elbaek, Mikael K., and Lars Nondal. 2007. The library as a mediator for e-publishing: A case on how a library can become a significant factor in facilitating digital scholarly communication and open access publishing for less web-savvy journals. *First Monday (Online)* 12, (10).
- English, Ray. 2005. The system of scholarly communication: Shaping the future. *Library Issues: Briefings for Faculty and Administrators* 25 (3): 1-4.
- Esposito, Joseph. 2008. Open access 2.0: Access to scholarly publications moves to a new phase. *Journal of Electronic Publishing* 11 (2).
- European Commission. 2008. *Open access, opportunities and challenges : A handbook*. Luxembourg: Office for official publications of the European Communities.
- Fisher, Julian H. 2008. Scholarly publishing re-invented: Real costs and real freedoms. *JEP: The Journal of Electronic Publishing* 11 (2).
- Foster, Connie. 2008. Special focus: Open access revisited. *Serials Review* 34 (1): 11-38.
- Furlough, Michael. 2008. University presses and scholarly communication: Potential for collaboration. *College & Research Libraries News* 69, (1): 32-6.
- Garrett, Marie. 2008. Newfound press. *College & Research Libraries News* 69 (6): 332.
- Gedye, Richard. 2006. Open access: Walking the talk. *Against the Grain* 18 (5): 79-8.
- . 2004. Open access is only part of the story. *Serials Review* 30, (4): 271-4.
- Gill, John. 2009. Analysis backs open-access path for scholarly publishing. *Times Higher Education*(1882): 14(1)-15.
- Givler, Peter. 2005. Letter to Google. Available at http://aaupnet.org/aboutup/issues/0865_001.pdf. Accessed 21 January 2010.
- Greco, Albert N., and R.M. Wharton. 2008. Should University Presses Adopt an Open Access [Electronic Publishing] Business Model for All of Their Scholarly Books? Proceedings ELPUB Conference on Electronic Publishing, Toronto, Ontario, Canada. June 2008.
- Greco, A. N., R. F. Jones, R. M. Wharton, and H. Estelami. 2007. The changing college and university library market for university press books and journals: 1997-2004. *Journal of Scholarly Publishing* 39 (1): 1-32.
- Guedon, Jean-Claude. 2008. Mixing and matching the green and gold roads to open access--take 2. *Serials Review* 34 (1): 41-25.
- Guthrie, Kevin, Rebecca Griffiths, and Nancy Maron. 2008. Sustainability and Revenue Models for Online Academic Resources: An Ithaka Report. Available at

http://www.ithaka.org/ithaka-s-r/strategy/sca_ithaka_sustainability_report-final.pdf.

Accessed 12 October 2009.

Hagenhoff, Svenja, Matthias Blumenstiel, and Björn Ortelbach. 2008. An empirical analysis of the amount of publication fees. *Serials Review* 34 (4): 257-66.

Hahn, Karla. 2007. The Changing Environment of University Publishing. *ARL: A Bimonthly Report on Research Library Issues and Actions from ARL, CNI, and SPARC*, 252/253: 1.

Hane, Paula J. 2008. Google developments, access to public resources, and more. *Information Today* 25 (2): 7-12.

Harnad, Stevan, Tim Brody, Francois Vallieres, Les Carr, Steve Hitchcock, Yves Gingras, Charles Oppenheim, Chawki Hajjem, and Eberhard R. Hilf. 2008. The Access/Impact problem and the green and gold roads to open access: An update. *Serials Review* 34 (1): 36-194.

Heath, Malcolm, Michael Jubb, and David Robey. 2008. E-publication and open access in the arts and humanities in the UK. *Ariadne* 54.

Held, Michael J., Maria Francisca Ham, Sutanti Siti Namtini, Wen-Juan Luo, and Et al. 2004. Open-access publishing. *The Lancet* 364: 24-6.

Houghton, John, Charles Oppenheim, Anne Morris, Claire Creaser, Helen Greenwood, Mark Summers, and Adrian Gourlay. 2009. *Economic implications of alternative scholarly publishing models: Exploring the costs and benefits*. A report to the Joint Information Systems Committee. Available at <http://www.jisc.ac.uk/media/documents/publications/rpconomicoapublishing.pdf>. Accessed 12 November 2009.

Houghton, John, and Peter Sheehan. 2009. Estimating the potential impacts of open access to research findings. *Economic Analysis and Policy* 39 (1): 127-42.

Howard, Jennifer. 2009a. Humanities journals confront identity crisis. *Chronicle of Higher Education* 55 (29): 1.

———. 2009b. A new push to unlock university-based research. *Chronicle of Higher Education* 55 (26): 10.

———. 2008. For advice on publishing in the digital world, scholars turn to campus libraries. *Chronicle of Higher Education* 55 (13): 8.

———. 2008. Landmark digital history monograph project goes open access. *The Chronicle of Higher Education* 54 (26): A.12.

———. 2008. High drama marks hearing over free access to published research. *Chronicle of Higher Education* 55 (5): 12.

———. 2007. University press meeting dominated by donor proposal and digital publishing. *Chronicle of Higher Education* 53 (43): 12.

Jaschik, Scott. 2007. New Model for University Presses. Available at <http://www.insidehighered.com/news/2007/07/31/ricepress>. Accessed 26 January 2010.

Johnson, Richard K. 2004. Open Access: Unlocking the Value of Scientific Research. Presentation at *The New Challenge for Research Libraries: Collection Management and Strategic Access to Digital Resources*, University of Oklahoma, 4-5 March 2004. Available at http://www.arl.org/sparc/bm~doc/johnson_openaccess-2.pdf. Accessed November 18 2009.

-
- Kaser, Dick. 2008. OA and the end game. *Information Today* 25 (2): 14.
- . 2007. OA in 2006: Three tidbits. *Information Today* 24 (1): 14.
- Kelty, Christopher M., Michael M. J. Fischer, Alex Rex Golub, Jason Baird Jackson, Kimberly Christen, Michael F. Brown, and Tom Boellstorff. 2008. Anthropology of/in circulation: The future of open access and scholarly societies. *Cultural Anthropology* 23 (3): 559-88.
- Kirsop, Barbara. 2008. Open access to publicly funded research information: The race is on. *DESIDOC Journal of Library & Information Technology* 28 (1): 41-8.
- Kline Pope, Barbara, and P.K. Kannan. 2003. An Evaluation Study of the National Academies Press' E-Publishing Initiatives: Final Report. Available at <http://aaupnet.org/resources/mellon/nap/index.html>. Accessed 21 January 2010.
- Lai, K. (1). 2008. Open access: Major issues and global initiatives. *DESIDOC Bulletin of Information Technology* 28 (1): 67-71.
- Lewis, David W. 2008. Library budgets, open access, and the future scholarly communication: Transformations in academic publishing. *College & Research Libraries News* 69 (5): 271-3.
- Look, Hugh, and Sue Sparks. 2008. Does information always want to be free? And can it survive in the wild if it does? *Library & Information Update* 7 (3): 26-9.
- Macdonald, C. 2008. Outlook for scholarly publishing: "So who's got the plan?". *Feliciter* 54 (3): 114-6.
- Marks, Jayne, and Rolf A. Janke. 2009. The future of academic publishing: A view from the top. *Journal of Library Administration* 49 (4): 439-58.
- Maron, Nancy L., K. Kirby Smith, and Matthew Loy. 2009. *Sustaining Digital Resources: An On-the-Ground View of Projects Today: Ithaka Case Studies in Sustainability*. Available at http://www.ithaka.org/ithaka-s-r/strategy/ithaka-case-studies-in-sustainability/report/SCA_Ithaka_SustainingDigitalResources_Report.pdf. Accessed 1 November 2009.
- Maron, Nancy L., and K. Kirby Smith. 2008. *Current models of digital scholarly communication: Results of an investigation conducted by Ithaka for the association of research libraries*. Washington D.C.: Association of Research Libraries.
- Mattison, David. 2008. Crisis or opportunity. *Searcher* 16 (1): 28-62.
- McClure, Marji. 2008. Case study: Open access yields solid growth for Hindawi. *Information Today* 25 (5): 1, 48, 50.
- McLennan, Jennifer. 2008. New SPARC campaign engages students on open access. *ARL* 256: 8.
- Miller, R. 2009. Open access: Battles to democratize academic publishing. *EContent* 32 (3): 32-6.
- Morrison, Heather. 2007. Rethinking collections – Libraries and librarians in an open age: A theoretical view. *First Monday (Online)* 12 (10).
- Morrison, Heather, and Andrew Waller. 2008. Open access and evolving scholarly communication: An overview of library advocacy and commitment, institutional

-
- repositories, and publishing in Canada. *College & Research Libraries News* 69 (8): 486-90.
- Morton, Clare. 2008. Oxford journals' view on open access. *English Association Newsletter* 188: 7-9.
- Mullen, Laura Bowering. 2009. Publishers and librarians: New dialogues in challenging times. *Issues in Science & Technology Librarianship* 56.
- Munshi, Usha Mujoo. 2008. Open access: How open can we make the scholarly information system? *DESIDOC Journal of Library & Information Technology* 28 (1): 3-29.
- Murphy, John. 2008. New entry tries new publishing model. *Research Information* 39: 18-9.
- OECD. 2005. Digital Broadband Content: Scientific Publishing. OECD: Paris. Available at Available at <http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/42/12/35393145.pdf>. Accessed 21 January 2010.
- Oppenheim, Charles. 2008. Electronic scholarly publishing and open access. *Journal of Information Science* 34 (4): 577-90.
- Owen, G. W. Brian, and Kevin Stranack. 2008. The public knowledge project and the simon fraser university library: A partnership in open source and open access. *The Serials Librarian* 55 (1/2): 140-67.
- Owen, T. B. 2008. From ideology to commercial reality [open access publishing]. *Information World Review* 252 (12): 9-10.
- Peek, Robin. 2009a. No stranger times than these. *Information Today* 26 (4): 13-4.
- . 2009b. The tide has changed, get over it. *Information Today* 26 (5): 13-5.
- . 2006. The oxford university press on OA. *Information Today* 23 (8): 17-136.
- Perkins, Lesley, and Heather Morrison. 2005. Open Access: Perspectives from SSHRC and NRC. Available at <http://oalibarian.blogspot.com/2005/10/perspectives-on-oa-sshrc-and-nrc-press.html>. Accessed 1 October 2009.
- Peters, Paul. 2007. Redefining scholarly publishing as a service industry. *Journal of Electronic Publishing* 10 (3).
- Phillips, Linda L. 2007. Newfound press: The digital imprint of the University of Tennessee libraries. *First Monday* 12 (10).
- Pinter, Frances. 2008. A radically new model for scholarly communications. *LOGOS* 19 (4): 203-6.
- Poltronieri, Elisabetta, and Paola De Castro. 2008. Taking the first steps towards institutional open access. *Research Information* 36: 14-5.
- Prosser, David, and Paul Ayriss. 2007. ACRL/SPARC forum explores open access models: The future of scholarly publishing. *College & Research Libraries News* 68 (8): 518-21.
- Pyati, Ajit. 2007. A critical theory of open access: Libraries and electronic publishing. *First Monday (Online)* 12 (10).
- Quint, Barbara. 2009. University presses: The next to go? *Information Today* 26 (4): 7-8.
- Richardson, Martin. 2005. Open access: Evidence-based policy or policy-based evidence? The university press perspective. *Serials* 18 (1): 35-7.
- Rieh, Soo Young, Beth St. Jean, Elizabeth Yakel, Karen Markey, and Jihyun Kim. 2008. Perceptions and experiences of staff in the planning and implementation of institutional

-
- repositories. *Library Trends* 57 (2): 168-90.
- Rockwood, Irving E. 2007. The open access debate: Phase 2. *Choice* 45 (4): 568.
- Scholarly Publishing Roundtable. 2010. *Report and Recommendations from the Scholarly Publishing Roundtable*. Available at http://www.aau.edu/policy/scholarly_publishing_roundtable.aspx?id=6894. Accessed 13 January 2010.
- Short, Robert. 2007. Open access will mean peer review will become "the job of the many, not the select few". *British Medical Journal* 334:330.
- Sich, Adam, and Keith Nutthall. 2007. EC shies away from open access enforcement plan. *The Bookseller* 18 (1): 19.
- Smith, Russell. 2005. FreeBooks4Doctors: Open access transcends periodical literature. *Journal of Electronic Resources in Medical Libraries* 2 (4): 115-20.
- Smith, Steve. 2008. Is free the next big moneymaker? *EContent* 31 (1): 25
- Stange, Kari. 2005. Library consortia and open access initiatives. *Info Trend* 60 (4): 107-12.
- Steele, Colin. 2008. Scholarly Monograph Publishing in the 21st Century: the Future More Than Ever Should Be an Open Book. *Journal of Scholarly Publishing*, 11 (2). Available at <http://quod.lib.umich.edu/cgi/t/text/text-idx?c=jep:view=text;rgn=main;idno=3336451.0011.201>. Accessed 7 October 2009.
- Struik, Christina, Hilde Coldenbrander, Stephen Warren, Halina De Maurivez, Heather Joseph, Denise Koufogiannakis, Heather Morrison, Kathleen Shearer, Kumiko Vezina, and Andrew Waller. 2007. Transitioning to open access (OA). *First Monday (Online)* 12 (10).
- Suber, Peter. 2009. Open access in 2008. *JEP: The Journal of Electronic Publishing* 12: (1).
- . 2008. Open access and quality. *DESIDOC Journal of Library & Information Technology* 28 (1): 49-67.
- . 2008. Open access in 2007. *Journal of Electronic Publishing* 11 (1).
- . 2008. Open access to electronic theses and dissertations. *DESIDOC Journal of Library & Information Technology* 28 (1): 25-48.
- Talley, C. Richard. 2008. Open-access publishing: Why not? *American Journal of Health-System Pharmacy* 65 (16): 1511.
- Tananbaum, Greg. 2007. I hear the train a comin' - ALCTS: Part 1. *Against the Grain* 19 (1): 82-4.
- Thatcher, Sanford G. 2009. From the university presses -- the hidden digital revolution in scholarly publishing: POD, SRDP, the "long tail," and open access. *Against the Grain* 21 (2): 60-3.
- . 2008. From the university presses--the value added by copyediting. *Against the Grain* 20 (4): 69-85.
- . 2007. From the university presses – Collaborating to create cyberinfrastructure: A critique of the ACLS report on "our cultural commonwealth". *Against the Grain* 19 (4): 54-5.
- . 2007. The challenge of open access for university presses. *Learned Publishing* 20, (3): 165-72.
- Till, James E. 2008. The access principle. *University of Toronto Quarterly* 77 (1): 135-7.
- Trevitte, Chad, and Charles Henry. 2007. The Rice University Press initiative: An interview with Charles Henry. *Innovate: Journal of Online Education* 4 (1).

-
- Tsakonas, Giannis, and Christos Papatheodorou. 2008. Exploring usefulness and usability in the evaluation of open access digital libraries. *Information Processing & Management* 44 (3): 1234-50.
- Van Trier, Gerard. 2009. Focus: Scholarly publishing and open access. *European Review* 17 (1): 1-2.
- Waaijers, Leo, Bas Savenije, and Michel Wesseling. 2008. Copyright angst, lust for prestige and cost control: What institutions can do to ease open access. *Ariadne* 57 (Oct).
- Wagner, A. Ben. 2009. A&I, full text, and open access: Prophecy from the trenches. *Learned Publishing* 22 (1): 73-4.
- Waller, Andrew, and Heather Morrison. 2008. From the CLA task force on open access. *Feliciter* 54 (2): 50.
- . 2008. A leading-edge position statement on open access + ongoing interests in OA at CLA. *Feliciter* 54 (5): 200-1.
- Walters, William H., and Esther Isabelle Wilder. 2007. The cost implications of open-access publishing in the life sciences. *Bioscience* 57 (7): 619-25.
- Waltham, Mary. 2009. The Future of Scholarly Journals Publishing Among Social Science and Humanities Associations. Available at <http://www.nhalliance.org/bm~doc/hssreport.pdf>. Accessed 12 January 2010.
- Warren, Tom. 2008. Understanding knowledge as a commons: From theory to practice. *Technical Communication* 55 (3): 295.
- Waters, Donald. 2008. Open access publishing and the emerging infrastructure for 21st-century scholarship. *Journal of Electronic Publishing* 11 (1).
- Watkinson, Anthony. 2006. Open access: A publisher's view. *Logos* 17 (1): 12-21.
- Weitzman, Jonathan. 2004. Cornell launches an open access university press. *The Scientist* 18 (5): A1-2.
- . 2003. Traditional publisher experiments with open access. *The Scientist* 17 (1): 35-6.
- Whittaker, Martha. 2008. The challenge of acquisitions in the digital age. *Portal* 8 (4): 439-45.
- Willinsky, John, and R. Mendis. 2007. Open access on a zero budget: A case study of Postcolonial Text. *Information Research* 12 (3): 10.
- Willinsky, John. 2009a. The stratified economics of open access. *Economic Analysis and Policy* 39, (1) (March 2009): 53-70.
- . 2009b. The Publisher's Pushback against NIH's Public Access and Scholarly Publishing Sustainability. *PLoS Biology*, 7 (1): 20-22.
- . 2009c. Toward the Design of Open Monograph Press. *Journal of Electronic Publishing*, 12 (1). Available at <http://quod.lib.umich.edu/cgi/t/text/text-idx?c=jep;view=text;rgn=main;idno=3336451.0012.103>. Accessed 21 January 2010.
- . 2006. *The access principle: The case for open access to research and scholarship*. Digital libraries and electronic publishing series. Cambridge and London: MIT Press.
- Xia, J. F. 2009. Library publishing as a new model of scholarly communication. *Journal of Scholarly Publishing* 40 (4): 370-83.

Zimmermann, Christian. 2009. The economics of open access publishing. *Economic Analysis and Policy* 39 (1): 49-52.