# THE 7TH ANNUAL MUNIN CONFERENCE ON SCIENTIFIC PUBLISHING – NEW TRENDS

Emma Margret Skåden

The University of Tromsø Library has hosted the Munin Conference on an annual basis since 2006 and the 7th Munin Conference was held at the University of Tromsø the 22-23 November 2012. The targeted audience is scientists, research administrators, research librarians, publishers, and policy makers from Norway and the other Nordic countries. However, this year we had a total of 104 participants and of these there were 10 plus participants from outside the Nordic Countries.

The theme of the conference is connected to scholarly and scientific publishing and often has an Open Access angle to it. This year the conference focus was on new trends in scholarly publishing.

## The keynotes

The first keynote speaker was Damian Pattinson from Public Library of Science, PLoS ONE. Pattinson has been the Executive Editor of PLoS since 2010 and has overseen the growth of the journal from a promising upstart to an established world leader of the Open Access movement. His keynote address was *Megajournals and what they mean for the future of scientific publishing.* Since it was launched five years ago, PLOS ONE has redefined the scientific journal. The broad publication criteria and absence of page limits allowed PLOS ONE to grow at a rate never seen before in the industry, to a level where it needed its own category: the Megajournal. Recently, other publishers have sought to emulate the success of PLOS ONE with releases of their own megajournals. These new journals all have similar properties: full Open Access, editorial criteria based on sound science and not on significance or impact, fast turnaround, broad scope. In this talk he discussed the features of megajournals, their benefits and weaknesses, and what their arrival means for the future of scientific publishing.

The second keynote spealer, John Willinsky, is a Khosla Family Professor of Education at Stanford University and Professor of Publishing Studies at Simon Fraser University, where he directs the Public Knowledge Project which is dedicated to conducting research and developing software aimed at improving the public and scholarly quality of academic publishing. In addition to holding a keynote speech at the conferences' second day, Willinsky held a pre-conference workshop where he talked about Open Monograph Press, just launched from the Public Knowledge Project.

Willinsky also held a post-conference speech, on which he addressed the concept of intellectual property. This lecture was open for everyone to attend, not only the registered participants at the Munin Conference. His keynote address was titled *The Future of Scholarly Publishing Is the Future of Scholarship.* Here, Willinsky talked about the importance not to overlook the contribution of humanities and social science publishing in comparison with the biomedical publishing currently the beacon of open access publishing. The developments in open-access models, mega-journals, bibliometrics, monograph publishing, open data initiatives, or the dream of the universal library were some of the aspects he talked about. Based on a review of historical and economic elements that tend to distinguish scholarship from research, as well as a decade of working with independent scholar-publishers, the talk made the case for thinking more globally about the common advancement of learning in the digital era.

## Call for papers and presentations

Helle Goldman from the Norwegian Polar Institute and chief editor of their journal *Polar Research*, held a speech with the title *Polar Research: reflections two years after the journal's transition to open access.* She reflected on the journals convention from a traditional journal to an Open Access journal and shared practical lessons learned during the process and also outlined the benefits incurred so far.

Live Kvale from the Science Library at the University of Oslo talked about her master degree study with the title *Sharing of research data – a study among researchers at UMB (The Norwegian University of Life Science).* She showed us her findings regarding attitudes towards the collection and reuse of data collected in the sciences and the opportunity to share these data openly. Her study concluded that the processes of data sharing are far from optimized as researchers today primarily retrieve data from colleagues and a collegial network for data exchange takes time to establish. For the researchers to be willing to share their data certain criteria such as first publication and accreditation for reuse must be

fulfilled. In addition, the fears among the researchers for misuse must be taken into account. The attitude among the researchers towards making data openly available depends much on where the researchers are in their careers.

Just De Leeuwe and Anke Versteeg from Delft Technical University talked about *OA Fund Delft University of Technology.* The topic was the University Open Access Fund as an instrument in promoting the Open Access program at Delft University of Technology. TU Delft faculties or research groups are themselves responsible for funding the Open Access publications of their academics. If a faculty is unable to pay the author's fee, TU Delft Library can assist by financing all or part of it from the Open Access Fund, which was founded in 2008. The researchers' publications need to be reviewed by a recognized publisher who operates with Open Access as a business model. The scope of the Open Access Fund is not limited to sponsoring articles published in journals not included in the subscriptions of TU Delft Library, but also applies to books and book chapters, published as Open Access. They presented the outcomes of the OA fund within the framework of the current Open Access activities at Delft University.

Bård Smedsrød, professor at the University of Tromsø (and co-author Leif Longva), held a speech titled : *Professor, does your university (want to) know what you are doing?* Universities are constantly intensifying and improving their ways of recording and counting the achievements of their scientific staff. Nevertheless, there are still important tasks that go under the radar of the university counting regimes: Reviewing tasks. The scientists spend much of their time doing reviewing work for free for scientific journals. Most of these tasks are pivotal to the scientific society and the society in general. And they are of great importance for journals eager to maintain or improve their scholarly reputation, which next ensures their revenues. Smedsrød and Longva believe that those universities as employers and managers of public research funds, by taking interest in what their employees do and not do, will hold a potentially forceful tool to lead the publishing houses in directions desired by the university and the society.

Simon Thomson from Open Access Key presented an introduction of Open Access Key that was founded in 2011 by a former academic publishing executive and a business software developer who encountered first-hand the challenges facing universities and authors with the growth of open access publishing – both Green and Gold. Thomson elaborated around the question if infrastructures and resources are sufficiently developed to support the additional financial and time pressures that participants now face with the

establishment of the 'author pays' scholarly publishing model and the increasing number of open access mandates from research funders. Individual researchers, their universities and research funders, and the publishers themselves, all have a part to play in processing and managing individual fees. Thomson talked about how Open Access Key (OAK) as a new global company with an innovative and cost-effective solution can provide value to the parties involved in such transactions. In addition to this, OAK has the ability to deliver a range of administrative functionalities to the users, such as feeding the repositories with metadata information collected from each article that has passed through their platform. This kind of automatic workflow makes it possible to reduce the tasks for authors and administrators, allowing direct use of resources towards research.

Kaveh Bazargan is the founder of River Valley. With his title *ReView: a new approach to peer review, using WordPress* Bazargan showed us that using WordPress as a foundation for the reviewing system can result in a more flexible system with a user-friendly interface. Most of the systems used for peer-review are robust databases with secure control of user roles. In WordPress one can incorporate modified versions of available plugins, e.g. a social network module, which makes the peer-reviewing more user-friendly.

Jan Erik Frantsvåg from the University Library in Tromsø talked about the experiences from the publication fund of the University of Tromsø. This fund has been operating in almost two years now. Frantsvåg talked about how the fund started and the experiences up until now from both an administrative and economic point of view.

Dirk Pieper is Head of the Media Department and the Digital Library Coordinator of Bielefeld University. The title of his presentation was *A golden era for Open Access or a trend towards the golden road to Open Access?* Pieper's presentation explained The German Research Foundation (DFG) program and highlighted the experiences of Bielefeld University Library within and concluded, that riding on the golden road is not the only way for libraries to support universities making their publication output as visible as possible. DFG started the support program "Open Access Publishing" in 2010 with the overall goal to help universities establish long-lasting and reliable structures for paying OA publications which demand article processing charges.

### Publishers' sessions

For the first time, the Munin Conference had a publishers' session at the conference. We invited publishers to come and talk about their present visions

of how scholarly publishing will work in the future, and how they contribute to the realization of these visions. Four publishers were accepted for this session, Co-Action Publishing, Elsevier, Social Science Direct, and PLoS ONE.

First out was Caroline Sutton from C-Action Publishing with the title *Can small, independent publishers survive in the future?* In her presentation she discussed the role that can be played by smaller publishing houses and the challenges they face within the current marketplace, especially with the current trend with mega journals and large scale operations. Sutton concluded that their strength as a small publisher was that they are able to be flexible in addition to having a close contact with their customers.

Second out was none other than Elsevier. Federica Rosetta is a member of the Universal Access team at Elsevier and with her title *Elsevier's commitment to Universal Access* she informed us about Elseviers commitment to universal access and what universal access means for them. Rosetta talked about how Elsevier has established agreements and developed policies to allow authors who publish in Elsevier journals to comply with manuscript archiving requirements of several funding bodies, as specified as conditions of researcher grant awards. Further, Rosetta talked about how Elsevier offers several ways for authors to make their work available beyond the subscription model in several scientific areas spanning from Immunology to Pharma, Physics, and Genomics, and including well-known brands such as Cell Reports. This is done with 74 journals offering Open Archive and 23 Open Access journal titles available on ScienceDirect and a number already in the pipeline. Elsevier concluded that they believe that both open access-publishing and subscription publishing can co-exist, and that they will continue to close remaining access gaps globally.

Next out was Damian Pattinson from PLoS ONE. The title for his speech was *Article-level metrics and what they tell us about the impact of PLOS publications.* The Article-level metrics (ALM) program was an alternative to the journal-level metrics that scientists had relied on for a long time to identify important research. ALMs allow readers to see how many views, downloads, citations and shares an individual paper has received, and thus to determine its impact on a field. Over the past year, the ALM program has been expanded to include social media information, such as Facebook likes and Tweets, and novel web tools such as Mendeley and Citeulike. Researchers use this information to examine the links between early activity indicators and long-term citation data, and to identify what tools best predict truly high impact research. Pattinson also presented the latest additions to PLOS's ALMs suite, and showed some data on what these metrics can tell us about the impact of papers published in PLOS journals.

Dan Scott from Social Science Direct was the last man out in this session. With his title *From concept to reality: a publisher's experience of setting up in open access* he talked about how he, having worked in traditional publishing for many years, set out to offer a solution to the problem that beset the scholarly publishing industry and research dissemination. This problem stemmed from a boycott of Elsevier titles and the publication of reports (e.g. the Finch report in the UK. Social Sciences Directory and Humanities Directory were conceived as offering both a progressive publishing solution that cut publication times, made research freely available to all and encouraged inter-disciplinary learning, and also responds to changing user behaviour through the concentration of large amounts of materials that are easily searchable by keywords. Scott took us through how they set up the business, how they built the awareness through marketing, how they formed their consortia agreements and how they overcame the opposition and gained support.

### And more

In addition to a publishers' session we had invited four local researchers to hold short presentations about scholarly publishing. Their experiences, reflections and frustrations connected to the topic. Trond Trosterud told us about publication from the Sámi language technology view and Lars Bjertnæs' experiences with the access to research literature for his collaborators in the North West Russia and Baltikum. Benjamin Planque talked about how the focus in the scholarly publishing has shifted from quality in the research to quantity and the number of articles one write. Jan Yngve Sand gave us an update on how things are in England after they've launched a new Open Access policy.

We had also poster- and presentation stands in the conference area. There were 14 posters and 6 stands available for everyone to take a look at and discuss. Our experience from this was that this resulted in some good discussions, both formal and informal, but we should have put a poster session in our program. Next year we will do that.

We hope to see everyone, and also some new faces, again next year at the 8th Munin Conference. We can promise you the polar night period in Tromsø if you decide to come, but unfortunately we cannot promise you that you will see the northern light. But if you don't come at all you will never get to see it…

All of the presentations are available on film here http://tinyurl.com/d64j9qg .

You can read more about the conference here http://www.ub.uit.no/baser/ocs/index.php/Munin/MC7



**Emma Margret Skåden** Rådgiver Avdeling for IT, formidling og utvikling Universitetsbiblioteket, Universitetet i Tromsø