

Developing Institutional Open Access Publishing Models to Advance Scholarly Communication

Jan Erik Frantsvåg UiT The Arctic University of Norway WP2 Lead

The DIAMAS Landscape Report







Project background

- Earlier research showed problems with the structure of OA publishing
 - "A wide archipelago of relatively small journals serving diverse communities"
 - Bosman, J., Frantsvåg, J. E., Kramer, B., Langlais, P.-C., & Proudman, V. (2021). OA Diamond Journals Study. Part 1: Findings. Zenodo.
 - Diamond OA an import part of institutional publishing
 - DIAMAS to look at institutional publishing





The work

WP2

- Some 40 competent and interested persons from around 20 organisations participated
- Started in September 2022 and delivered the report end of November 2023





Little to build on

- No data previously collected on institutional publishing as such
- No organisations geared to institutional publishing as such
- Had to start from scratch
- Initiated a large survey
- Institutional Publishing Service Provider (IPSP) a central term
 - Institutional Publishing (IP) activities
 - Service providers (SP) to such IPs
 - Or combinations of IP and SP



What we did

- Created a survey
 - Trying to cover many aspects
- Tried identifying possible IPs and SPs in ERA
 - Data we had was skewed towards OA journal publishing
 - Some data relevant to OA and TA book publishing
 - o Engaged networks we knew of
- Sent out to more than 5,000 e-mail addresses late March-early May 2023 in 10 different languages
 - And to e-mail lists, and to organisations asking them to distribute to their members
- Due to the earthquake, dissemination to Türkiye was postponed until September
 - Country report planned for later this year



Some results





What did we get?

685 responses we could use

- An uneven geographical distribution
 - o But most countries adequately represented
- Our numbers indicate that a major part of IPSPs are represented
 - o But the smallest ones underrepresented
- 3/4 IPs, 1/4 SP
- 90% publish journals
 - Most publish relatively few journals, <5





Some major findings

- Countries are more different than regions are
- Organisation of scholarly publishing activities on a national scale very important
 - Support and administrative structures
 - Networks and organisations
 - Funding opportunities



Finances & organisation

- >2/3 are non-commercial public organisations
 - SPs more likely to be private companies
- ≈60% IPs and SPs part of a parent organisation
- Mainly small-scale activities
 - Heavily dependent on voluntary and in-kind contributions
- The Diamond model is very common
- APC used as a revenue stream by 19% of OA journals publishers
- VAC (voluntary author contributions) used by 23.5%



Finances & organisation cont.

- 54% of all-diamond publishers rely on fixed and permanent funding from parent organisation, 20% on periodically negotiated funding from parent
 - high reliance
- 31% rely on content and print sales
 - low reliance
- Some 70% would consider cooperating with others to save costs

At least in some area:

o IT services, Production services and Training, support and/or advice on publishing policies and best practice the most important, all with more than 40% inclination to cooperate



Open Science practices

- Double-anonymous peer review most common (76%)
- Open peer review used by 17%
 - ≈30% of respondents willing to implement in the future
 - Many use OJS for journal publishing, Open peer review not yet an option in OJS
- 90% of journal output OA
 - o 76% of conference output
 - o 58% of academic books
- 97% of journals OA in Eastern Europe
- Academic journals the most important output, >90% of respondents using this format



Open Science practices cont.

- 87% of respondents adhere to OA or Open Science policies on various levels
 - National, institutional, their own
 - Variation between countries, national policies not important in all countries
 - Most important for OA journals
- Only 45% consider their content well indexed, 55% want improvement
 - Satisfying technical and non-technical participation criteria together with metadata criteria a problem for 60%
 - Paying for membership and recurring charges a problem for >40%
 - More of a problem for smaller IPs
- Equity, Diversity, Inclusion and Belonging (EDIB) generally not well implemented



Takeaways

- The typical IP is small and rather alone
- Needs better and more stable, reliable, and long-term financing
- Needs partners to co-operate with
 - Bigger could be better?
- Needs support
 - Competence must be made available
 - Advice on best practices and how to best align with these
 - Support on how to implement various practices and technical options
- Strong willingness to align with Open Science practices and good publishing practices



Outputs available now

 A treasure trove is found at https://zenodo.org/communities//zenodo.org/communities//s/diamasproject?q=&l=list&p=1//&s=20&sort=newest





D2.1 IPSP Scoping Report <u>10.5281/zenodo.7890567</u>

Defining some concepts and giving a precise geographical definition

DIAMAS Survey Questionnaire and Glossary 10.5281/zenodo.10207447

The English version of the Questionnaire used in the survey, and the accompanying glossary

D2.3 Final IPSP landscape Report: Institutional Publishing in the ERA: Results from the DIAMAS survey 10.5281/zenodo.10022183

The full-length 237-page report including short country reports

Institutional publishing in the ERA: Full country reports 10.5281/zenodo.10026206

A supplement to the above, with longer country reports for some countries

The European landscape of institutional publishing - A synopsis of results from the DIAMAS survey 10.5281/zenodo.10551709

A short version of the full-length report

Institutional publishing in the ERA: Complete country reports 10.5281/zenodo.10473494

A companion to the synopsis – the longer country reports for the countries that has one, and the shorter reports for the other countries

DIAMAS survey on Institutional Publishing – aggregated data 10.5281/zenodo.10590502 Survey data aggregated on a level that allows us to share them