



The Nordbib project

Hprints - Licence to publish.2.

Phase 2

Final report

Nordbib, Copenhagen, August 2010

Ingegerd Rabow, Marjatta Sikström

Project coordinators:

1. Background

This is the final report from Phase 2, the last phase of the second Nordbib-project on *hprints* and related issues. The first project set out to establish an e-print archive for the humanities and social sciences.

As stated in the application to Nordbib's Focus Area "Policy and visibility" (Work Package 1), the purpose of the second project was to increase the awareness and understanding of the principles of Open Access by providing a dialogue among stakeholders on authors' rights and Open Access principles.

The Nordbib Board pledged the grant with clauses for the project framework thereby changing the project deliverables to the following for the second project, entitled "License to Publish". <http://www.nordbib.net/Projects/License-to-Publish.aspx>

1. Legal translations into the five Nordic languages, of the SURF/JISC/KE(Knowledge Exchange) "Licence to Publish" document - a standardised legal contract between author and publisher ensuring that the author retains the rights to her/his own work while the publisher receives the rights to publish it, and to disseminate these translations to the Nordic researchers in general.
2. "Devising a strategy for substantial outreach with respect to "Licence to publish", authors' rights, self-archiving and the principles of Open Access, focus on a number of cases in the Nordic social sciences and humanities but with the stipulation that the strategy be relevant and implementable to the STM (Science, Technology and Medicine) communities as well."

The project was hosted by CULIS Center for Scholarly Communication (Denmark) and was managed by a consortium consisting of the Head Office Lund University Libraries, Gothenburg University Library, Stockholm University Library, Faculty of Humanities, University of Copenhagen, the Nordic Institute of Asian Studies (NIAS), University of Copenhagen together with three NIAS collaborators: Chr. Michelsen Institute (CMI), Bergen (Norway), Norwegian University of Science and Technology (NTNU), Trondheim, and the Asia network, University of Turku (Finland)., Museum Tusulanum Press (Denmark) and the Danish Royal Library also participated in the consortium.

Phase 1 (clause 1 in the Nordbib pledge) was reported by the then project coordinator Simone Schipp von Branitz Nielsen together with Thea Drachen and Bertil F. Dorch in "*Licence to publish – promoting Open Access and authors' rights in the Nordic social sciences and humanities*" in August 2009.

As a result of the completion of Phase 1, Nordic scholars now have access to translations of "Licence to Publish" in the five Nordic languages, made available to Nordic researchers in general. All the translations can be found at the SURF/JISC Copyright Toolbox site <http://copyrighttoolbox.surf.nl/copyrighttoolbox/authors/licence/>

According to the second clause of the Nordbib pledge, Phase 2 was to forge an outreach campaign to researchers in select case domains in the humanities and the social sciences.

The duration of Phase 2 was set to 1st of January – 31st of July 2010, and the project coordinators for this phase have been Marjatta Sikström, Stockholm University Library, and Ingegerd Rabow, Head Office, Lund University Libraries.

2. Activities

The activities of Phase 2 were discussed and planned both via the project Internet site and at two meetings.

The first meeting, initiating the concrete planning for Phase 2, was a project coordinator meeting between Bertil Dorch (then project coordinator), and Marjatta Sikström and Ingegerd Rabow (incoming project coordinators), held in Lund January 15, 2010.

The second meeting was a workshop & tutorial in Gothenburg March 1, 2010.

Among the issues discussed at the workshop in Gothenburg were the responsibility for validation in *hprints*. It was decided, that validation should be done country wise – with shared responsibility by administrators within the country in question, and to contact the representatives in France to reshape the flow of validation in *hprints*. Other issues were the help-desk functions and a wish list for the improvements of the help-texts, and the functionality of the archive (for CNRS).

The specific object of Phase 2 was to devise a strategy for substantial outreach with respect to “Licence to publish”, authors’ rights, self-archiving and the principles of Open Access, by focusing on a number of cases in the Nordic social sciences and humanities.

The methodology chosen was carefully selected *case studies*, aiming to discover and exemplify the actual knowledge of the OA-concept, the current attitudes and viewpoints of the participating researchers, and to promote as large scale comprehension of the OA – publishing processes as possible. The purpose for this deliverable was to develop a user-centered, functional model for the promotion of OA publishing within the humanities and social sciences – but also applicable within other disciplines.

2.1. Case studies – methods and results

The case studies were carried out at three of the participating universities: the University of Copenhagen, the University of Gothenburg, and the University of Stockholm. Specific focus groups were selected as being of special interest for the project. Among overall selection criteria for the cases were:

- Expected benefits from the focused outreach
- Positive inclination of the group towards the project
- Equal geographical dissemination among the Nordic project participants

Copenhagen University Library set up a case study within the Department of English. For the full report authored by Mia Nyman see Appendix 1.

Gothenburg University Library set up a case study with a research group within The Department of Philosophy, Linguistics and Theory of Science. For the full report authored by Jonas Gilbert & Lena Ivarsson. See Appendix 2.

Stockholm University Library set up case studies within the Department of Scandinavian Languages, and the Department of French, Italian and Classical Languages. For the full report authored by Marjatta Sikström see Appendix 3.

The case studies performed at the universities of Copenhagen, Gothenburg, and Stockholm yielded some interesting insights into the daily work of researchers, and their knowledge and opinions of publishing in general, and, specifically, of Open Access publishing.

The methods used were individual interviews, group interviews, and meetings. Participants in the case groups were chosen to reflect various career stages - from PhD students to professors. This was done to secure as wide a representation as possible regarding publication experiences. Focus was on the following questions:

1. Where do researchers look for information about publishing?
2. What are the researchers' concerns about Open Access?
3. What are the obstacles for the researchers?
4. Do the researchers know their rights to self-archive?

The results are summarized below. For full case study reports see Appendices 1-3.

2.1.1. Knowledge

As there seemed to be no significant established knowledge about the whole OA-concept, e.g. OA-journals, OA archives, hybrid journals, various business models, and authors' rights, many researchers had not perceived the need for information on those issues. Important sites as the Directory of Open Access Journals (DOAJ), and SHERPA/ROMEO were not common knowledge.

There was little knowledge of their rights in connection with self-archiving, of addenda to publishers' agreements or of separate licenses to publish, e.g. the SURF/JUSC/KE Licence or the Creative Commons licences.

No one [Stockholm] mentioned the problem of embargo periods with self archiving which within humanities often are long.

It was noted [Gothenburg], that researchers kept publication lists with links to locally stored full-text files on their personal web pages, without being aware of potential publisher restrictions. In general, attention had not been paid to different versions of the manuscripts. They were not actively depositing the publications in other subject repositories, and were not aware that in several cases their publications were already available in for instance CiteSeer. <http://citeseer.ist.psu.edu/>

Most researchers had a fair idea of what OA stands for, but, surprisingly, researchers may still confuse Toll Access journals available on campus nets with Open Access journals freely available on the Internet.

Publishing issues, such as what journals to submit to, were generally discussed within departments, and younger researchers seek advice from their more established colleagues at home or abroad.

All the respondents were, of course, aware of the importance of publishing – both in order to disseminate results and to gain positions and funding. Their main concerns when discussing OA were quality, plagiarism, peer review, and gaining merits towards research funding.

Faculties and departments differ in relation to awareness of OA issues. Some are collectively more pro OA, while other departments still have not noticed – or ignored - the paradigm shift.

2.1.2. Attitudes

We met a *general* understanding, that OA can be of great advantage in order to gain visibility and get feed-back from fellow scholars. Established researchers, though, did not express any significant need for OA, as they already had sufficient publishing channels via established journals,

As mentioned above, a fundamental concern was the academic level of the publications archived in repositories. There was a genuine fear of having their research denounced as of low quality, if archived together with publications of lower academic quality. The concept of peer-review was of overall importance.

Questions were asked about parallel publishing in relation to current bibliometric assessments: “do I get points if I publish open access parallel with traditional publishing”.

After having received information, researchers expressed their interest in depositing their publications in *hprints*.

Stockholm noted that attitudes toward OA within the Faculty of Humanities generally are more positive than in many of the departments within the Faculty of Natural Sciences. This might indicate that the humanities are threatened nowadays and therefore more inclined to find new possibilities, or it might be interpreted as a sign of progressiveness, of humanities being in the front line of new developments in scholarly communication.

Positive

- Accessibility, visibility, early access. Publishing processes **are** generally too slow, sometimes up to a year for an article. Open archives could be a good alternative if supplied with clear mark of quality. Visibility in Google and Google Scholar was seen as a tasty carrot for using repositories,

There was a prevailing positive attitude to OA in the form of *parallel publishing*, as this model does not jeopardize the traditional system of ranking by publishing in prestigious journals.

The high relevance ranking of open archives in Google seems to be more important than developing search systems in the archives themselves.

Negative/Obstacles.

- Lack of time was a standard complaint as well as doubts about quality. OA journals tend to be considered as not yet fully established and recognized, and their potential impact factor was questioned.

2.1.3. Conclusions

Our case studies have shown that when informed more thoroughly about OA, researchers realised the potential advantages for them. The universities have a role here as well as the libraries that manage the archives and support scholars in various aspects of the publishing processes.

It is important to show that the increased visibility of OA-publishing might result in more feedback from fellow researchers in the form of new contacts and/or more citations. Experience shows that the open archives were not taken seriously until they began to be used for bibliometric research assessments. Publishing policy and repositories became of vital interest for individual researchers and their departments/universities.

There is also a need for practical and efficient tutorials to make it easier and quicker for researchers to archive and to handle various alternatives for rights management, always bearing in mind, that there is a wide variety in publishing formats within the humanities. Some sort of help desk function/email assistance must be in place, otherwise many well-intentioned but stressed researchers may give up, and all the outreach efforts have been in vain.

The same strategies and methods for promoting comprehension of OA- publishing may not work for all research areas, faculties and departments. Adjustments must be made for specific target groups and research areas.

Special advocacy efforts should be targeted towards decision makers within universities for discussions of economic plans, statistics, and business models that would be the most cost-efficient alternatives for their library budgets and - in the end - for society. Future sustainable business models for OA publishing must be found...

Instead of universities, many research funders have taken a lead in OA and are now posting publishing policies more radical than those of the universities.

An effective outreach strategy for libraries would therefore be to seek alliances with research funders, e.g. to arrange joint seminars where funders, grantees, and university leaders can discuss the new publishing conditions with library expertise on how to implement them. This involves the how-to's of self-archiving, finding relevant OA or hybrid journals, and managing copyright fundamentals.

Authors' rights will have to be discussed more in depth. To gain wide acceptance, alternative model licences should be sanctioned by important stakeholders, e.g. funders and universities. Few individual researchers have that kind of negotiating power on their own behalf. The SURF/JISC/KE Licence to Publish is one model to use...

Even if researchers manage to deposit in their institutional repositories, they are often reluctant to deposit simultaneously in other open archives, often because they lack the time and energy to handle different platforms and interfaces. *"My article is already deposited in the institutional open archive and searchable via Google. Why deposit it twice?"* to quote one researcher...

In view of this, it is important that future developments not only allow researchers easy deposit in their institutional repositories, but also give them a choice of other archives relevant for uploading, e.g. **hprints**, just by pressing the corresponding buttons. Uploading to these additional archives should be a normal part of the workflow. (See also above under 3.2.Specifications

To provide sustainable services we believe that institutional and subject based repositories should be linked with each other. A good example of a subject based repository aggregating data from institutional repositories via OAI-PMH-harvesting is **Economists Online**, launched in 2010 <http://www.economistsonline.org> . This service also provides related information

such as datasets and more personalized publication lists, something our researchers like to see...

We find this an interesting initiative, both since it is time-effective (getting data from institutional sources) and has a more 'CV:ish' presentation style of the authors and the publications. Certainly features like this would also be of interest in **hprints**.

<http://www.economistsonline.org/scholar?partnerId=tilburguniversity-nl&scholarId=ha>

Libraries are traditionally service providers with a mission to facilitate the knowledge production and dissemination of research results. Today's transitional and for researchers confusing state of scholarly communication should also lead to a modification of the missions of research libraries. Even they should undergo a kind of paradigm shift.

As it was suggested in one of the discussions, research libraries should add to their current profiles a unit for research information dissemination - an Office of Scholarly Communication.

2.2. General outreach activities

2.2.1. FOLDER.

A decision was taken to collectively produce an end-user friendly, pocket-sized folder about the **hprints** archive, Open Access, self-archiving, and authors' rights. The folder also includes a short presentation of Nordbib. The folder is targeted for researchers and can be used both for general promotion and for conferences, seminars, workshops, tutorials etc. An edition of 1.000 coloured copies was produced by a professional print shop. See Appendix 4.

Examples of usage:

- This **hprints** folder has been used by Marjatta Sikström, who gave a short presentation of **hprints** as a new Nordic infrastructural tool within the humanities at the conference at Stockholm University on the 5th of February, 2010: *Humanistiska forsknin gens nya infrastrukturer. Bibliotek som infrastrukturella värdar*. All participants (ca 100), representing research funders, researchers and librarians, received a folder.
<http://www.sub.su.se/omsub/visaevenemanget.aspx?eid=93>
- Göteborg Universitet Online 15 april 2010. Seminars and promoting activities directed at teachers and researchers at the university. Distribution of **Hprints** folder and demonstrations of the service. http://www.pil.gu.se/quonline/quonline_april_2010/

2.2.2. Articles, presentations

- A short article about **hprints** was published in Stockholm University Library's *Nyhetsbrev (Newsletter)* in February 2010
<http://www.sub.su.se/nyhetsbrev/nyhetsartikel.aspx?nbar=538>
- A full scale article describing the **hprints**-project and archive was published in the May issue of *ScieCom info* (2010). "UTILIZING HPRINTS.ORG AS A SUBJECT BASED RESEARCH INFRASTRUCTURE" by Søren Bertil Fabricius Dorch, Ingegerd Rabow, Marjatta Sikström, Simone Schipp von Branitz Nielsen, Jonas Gilbert, Mia Nyman & Thea Marie Drachen. See Appendix 5

<http://www.sciecom.org/ojs/index.php/sciecominfo/article/view/3621/3170>

- The Wikipedia texts about **hprints** have been updated or created by Mia Nyman, and are available at
<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hprints>
<http://da.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hprints>
<http://sv.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hprints>
<http://no.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hprints>
- At Stockholm University, specific **hprints** presentations were run by Marjatta Sikström at the Department of Scandinavian Languages, and at the Department of French, Italian and Classical Languages.(March-April 2010)

She also gave a special seminar on **hprints** at Nordiska museet for their library staff, and for the library staff of Arkitekturmuseet (May 2010)
- In connection with regular Open Access outreach campaigns at a number of departments **hprints** was highlighted as an example of a subject specific open repository.
- Other presentations at meetings within universities, departments, institutes

3. Hprints – structure, terminology, functionality, work-flows

At the meetings of the project group several dysfunctionalities were found and were to be reported back to TEL (Theses in HAL <http://tel.archives-ouvertes.fr/>) or to HAL. The current workflow with PhD theses was considered unsatisfactory. The project group wanted the possibility to deposit PhD theses directly into **hprints**, not into TEL. The Nordic countries want at least validate the theses in **hprints**/TEL themselves.

The help-texts in **hprints** have been updated and improved by Mia Nyman and Bertil Dorch and Jonas Gilbert have controlled and edited the text on the home page of **hprints**.

Two new subject terms for the subject list in **hprints** were proposed:

Theology

Medieval studies

The possibility of automatic batch uploads from other archives to **hprints** was seen as very important and was to be discussed with the host HAL. See below under 3.2. Specifications.

3.1. The terminology in hprints

It is very important for the credibility and authority of the **hprints** archive that the language and terminology is clear, easy, and correct. When studying the English translations of the texts in **hprints**, we found them non-idiomatic and lacking in clarity,

We believe, that the texts in the archive have to be revised and checked page by page and field by field, if the archive is to have a terminology that is in accordance with international usage in these contexts.

We have found that a total revision of the English translation is necessary, but this will need a separate project. Our original idea was to present a list of obviously odd terms used when translating from French into English, but we have come to the conclusion, that a single list of suggestions for changes is not enough.

Such a revision is too demanding for this project phase and does not fit into this project frame. The revision has to be planned and performed separately. The revision requires close cooperation with the staff at CRNS or, as an alternative, the Scandinavian *hprints* representatives could be given permission to revise and rewrite the translations from French to English, if/when a 3rd project phase is funded.

Here follows some examples from the current texts in *hprints*. These examples should be enough to demonstrate the need for a revision:

Examples of formulations with some suggested translations.

- Thanks to select an article - should be Please select an article
- Thanks you to verify this document - should be Please verify...
- Start to inform the author name - should be Fill in the author's name
- Laboratory name - should be Affiliation/university
- Publishing year, writing year- should be year of publication
- On standby of checking that you deposited and who are accessible on line
- A document with fulltext will appear in the subscription systems of HAL and, if it belongs to a subject of arXiv, will be transferred on this basis [h4] (except if the you require the opposite explicitly). For the submission of an "old" article, you must provide the year when the article was written

3.2. Specifications for automated exports from IR:s to hprints

Jonas Gilbert at Gothenburg University had accepted to investigate the possibility of automated exports from institutional repositories to *hprints*, and if there were any specifications for exporting data to *hprints*/HAL. In the last moment of the project, he finally got a response from the French administrators of HAL, where the *hprints* archive is hosted.

Since this information came at such a late point, we will not be able to do any tests of the exporting routines within this project frame. All documents are only available in French, but the HAL administrators kindly offered to do English translations.

According to the response, HAL provides two methods for exporting to HAL: export via XML or via Web Services (SOAP API). The documentation is available (at present only in French):

- <http://www.ccsd.cnrs.fr/spip.php?rubrique31> (home)
- http://import.ccsd.cnrs.fr/doc/doc_importXML.pdf (xml)
- http://www.ccsd.cnrs.fr/IMG/pdf_Les_WebServices_HAL.pdf (api soap)

These routine descriptions are probably what we were looking for and what we discussed. It would thus be a good idea to translate them into English. As discussed above under 3.1., good English translations are necessary. Implementation and functionality tests are also needed. We suggest a Phase 3 of this Nordbib project. If we expect our researchers to

deposit their publications both in mandatory open institutional repositories and in open subject archives, these kinds of routines can be crucial.

In their report from Gothenburg University Gilbert & Ivarsson write (see Appendix 2):

“We believe that one important question is how we can make the local, institutional repository working as a link to the subject focused repository, in this case *hprints*. It is clearly our aim to deliver efficient and time saving services to the researchers, as well as to avoid parallel workflows for the librarians giving support. With this ambition, we initially hoped to be able to test an export from the institutional repository to *hprints*. This was not realized, and one reason for this was that we had difficulties in receiving the specifications for export to *hprints*. /HAL (the contact person at CNRS didn't reply to our letters). We eventually learned that HAL supports import/export both through a XML-import and through a web service using SOAP. The documentation and technical specification are all only in French.”

Gilbert & Ivarsson also raise another important issue, i.e. regarding the contractual possibility to export from the local repository. The University of Gothenburg, like many other universities, use an agreement between the author and the University for e-publishing/depositing in the university repository. “This [Gothenburg] agreement does not permit us to do automatic exports of the full-text files to services outside of the university. This means that we would have to get an explicit permission from the author to export the full-text document to *hprints*/HAL.”

4. A plan for future outreach activities

After analysing the results of our various outreach activities, interviews, and discussions with researchers, we conclude, that the following methods for promoting comprehension and usage of OA-publishing are vital:

- Provide local consultation in all publishing matters including copyright issues - **Office of Scholarly Communication**.
- Work for the development of archives that are intuitive and easy to use, compatible with each other with easy import and export functions.
- Work with outreach activities on several fronts: with individual researchers, with departments, and with the leaders on different levels at the universities. A sustainable change requires awareness and active support by the decision and policy makers.
- Use a licence to publish specifically designed for Open Access publishing.
- When planning outreach activities vary them according to target groups, subject areas and their traditional and still prevailing communication patterns. One size does not fit all.
- Create alliances for outreach campaigns with actors outside the library walls, e.g. with research funders.
- Attend and be visible at scholarly conferences and market Open Access archives there.

- Provide personal assistance with work-flows in archives.
- Arrange hands-on workshops where researchers can drop in with their documents and where they can be helped to upload publications into archives of their choices.
- Provide a stable help-desk and support function.
- Be visible on campus in different contexts: seminars, conferences, web sites etc
- Provide and follow up statistics on the university's web site on successes in OA publishing: for instance number of downloads, the most down loaded documents, make comparisons.
- Always appeal to the individual researcher's ego: increased visibility and increased impact.
- Cultivate all personal contacts among researchers and their 'gate keepers'. Personal and informal contacts in outreach and promotion activities are not to be underestimated.
- Be systematic and patient, change takes time.