This is the transcript of the opening session of the Envisioning a World Beyond APCs/BPCs symposium held at the University of Kansas on November 17, 2016.

More information, including video and participant biographies is available at https://openaccess.ku.edu/symposium.

>> Ada Emmett: Okay, we are live here now from the University of Kansas. I want to welcome our virtual audience you to the University of Kansas, the beautiful Spooner Hall, The Commons venue that we're in today for the Envisioning a World Beyond APCs/BPCs. I'm Ada Emmett. I'm the Director of the University of Kansas Libraries' David Shulenburger Office of Scholarly Communication and Copyright. I, along with my co‑planners, Rebecca Kennison and Bob Kieft from K|N Consultants are thrilled to have a wonderful array of speakers and experts from around the world and different disciplinary groups and stakeholder groups.

We have a global audience with us today. I want to encourage the viewers of this live broadcast to go to the list of panelists where you have a full description, job title, beautiful pictures of the lovely bouquet of people we have here and their background and experience working in this field of open access and publishing. Please, live audience as well as those in the room, feel free to tweet out a greeting from where you are coming from, your institution and what part of the world. We're very excited to have, again, a live audience with us. The twitter hashtag is #KUOASymp16. Let's see. Please do tweet out your questions. What is going to happen is we'll have our live panelists here give quick 2‑minute talks and we would like our live audience to tweet: questions, comments, what have we missed? We'll have a record of that whether or not during this 2‑hour period we'll be able to address those but we will be attempting to address questions directly to the panelists and respondents that are in the room.

Also, we have a Google doc that is open for public comments for you to put your comments, questions, and thoughts, and we welcome you to use that. That is also linked from the page where you are now seeing us at the top. Please note also that there is closed captioning for those who like to use

that lower down on the page. I would now like to introduce to you the Dean of KU Libraries here at the University of Kansas, Kevin Smith, who will moderate the live stream session. He'll explain the goals of the session and the rest of the two hours, so Kevin.

>> <mark>Kevin Smith:</mark> Thank you, Ada. Good morning; at least it is morning here in Lawrence, Kansas. We're delighted that you are joining us. Welcome to this 2‑hour live broadcast of a symposium on open access publishing entitled, Envisioning a World Beyond APCs. As Ada said, I'm Kevin Smith, the Dean of Libraries here at the University of Kansas and I will be moderating this event that is taking place here on the KU campus. We are delighted to have folks from around the world joining us through the live broadcast. I hope you are listening and that you will participate using the Google doc and the Twitter hashtag. The purpose of this day and a half symposium is to consider the models that are available for achieving an expansive, inclusive, and balanced global ecosystem for open publishing. We have been privileged to assemble an international group of highly respected individuals from academia, publishing, librarians, and NGOs to engage in a dialogue around one of the most fundamental questions for the open access movement. To what extent can a global academic community create an open access publishing system that is without cost to authors or readers? If this is possible, how? If it's not possible, what are the barriers? This live stream broadcast which opens our symposium asks each of our 18 panelists to provide a *brief*, as Ada said, two minutes only; we're going to police that ‑‑ a brief explanation of what they from their own particular experiences or perspective still need to know to answer this question. As part of this lightning round talk, we have asked each panelist to address some sub-questions: Given your focus or project, what do you not know about open access publishing that would help us to create the future we envision? What do our scholarly publishing communities still need to know or to do in order to develop this expansive open and balanced ecosystem for worldwide open access? After each panelist has spoken, we will take a short 2‑minute, we hope 2‑minute break, to allow for our cameras to be readjusted in order to broadcast the second hour of discussion. I will come back to the front to help moderate. We also have a distinguished group of respondents here at KU and we will ask them to make comments on what they have heard. This is also the chance for

those of you who are watching the live stream to participate by sending your comments or questions to our Twitter hashtag or by using the Google doc that is provided. The hashtag and a link to the Google doc should be on the web page that you're looking at right now. Our panelists, respondents and I hope our virtual participants will talk and think together as part of a collaborative problem solving endeavor that helps us to envision an open future for publishing that is accessible and just for all authors and readers. With that, I will invite our first speaker to the podium. Each speaker will introduce themselves. Juan.

>> Juan Pablo Alperin: Thank you, and thank you for the opportunity to be here. I'm Juan Pablo Alperin from Simon Fraser University and from the Public Knowledge Project. I think we all agree we would like a world in which all of the content that is published in academic journals is published in a way that is accessible to everyone. A world in which there are barriers to access and knowledge is problematic. But a world that provides that access through article processing charges does so by changing the problem of exclusion from problem of access to access to read to a problem of access to write. In particular for parts of the world, that have less resources available to them and from institutions and from people working from fields in which there are not abundant resources to pay article charges. And so that world in which we have, we lose the access to be able to contribute and participate in scholarship is in some ways even more problematic than the world in which we might be able to gain that access through some other means, through green open access or through accessing through friends and family and through other ways that people from developing countries have managed to gain access to the work; a world in which they can't participate to write is even worse than a world in which they cannot access to read. So, surely, people say, that waivers can solve this problem. But I like to say that Latin America definitely does not need the charity. Latin‑America, in fact, is already providing more to the world ‑‑ 30 seconds -- already providing more to the world by making all of its content that they publish freely available to the rest of the world. And so this is the worst deal ever, in the words of your president elect. This is a deal that in which South America loses bigly, okay? We need to take back ownership of our publications. I think the world in which how we solve this problem is by having scholarly publishing come back to being scholar-led

and scholar-owned. I think we can take some lessons from the platform cooperativism movement in which those benefits that the online platforms give us come back to the community of stakeholders. Thank you.

>> <mark>Ivy Anderson:</mark> Good morning. I'm Ivy Anderson from the California Digital Library. First of all, I know the topic of our symposium is also intended to cover books as well as journals but I'll speak about journals and probably about APCs which is something that I have been studying a little bit more of late. So I would like to start with a few things that we do know. We know that authors at our institutions - and by that I mean primarily Western, North American, and European institutions; when I say "our", recognizing the culture that I do come from - are largely publishing in mainstream journals that ‑‑ mainstream journals that dominate Western publishing and they have not abandoned those journals in large numbers. Open access ranks quite low in author priorities. In fact, as Carol Tenopir put it in the University of California "Pay It Forward" study, reputation building, within a discipline, is by far the most important priority for academic authors. And so, as a result of that, we know that despite a long period of advocacy, gold OA or as I like to call it direct OA is still quite slow in terms of uptake and needs quite a bit of encouragement. So I think the two big gap questions for those of us who want to take back academic journal publishing or to reconstruct journal publishing in a radical new way, are: if we build it, will they come? And/or put differently, what are the conditions that we need to put in place to enable and encourage our scholars to make this transition. And I have much more to say but I guess I will stop there because I'm close to the end of time. I do want to say that with respect to other stakeholders such as societies, we talk ‑‑ we often talk about publishers in a very monolithic way and there is much more that we could do to engage with societies about what it would take for societies to transition their journals. I think transitioning journals is one of the issues that we have to confront not just creating new journals but transitioning the existing publishing environment.

>> <mark>Arianna Becerril Garcia:</mark> Good morning. Arianna Becerril Garcia from Redalyc. Thank you very much for the invitation to be with you today. I'm speaking here on behalf of many stakeholders in open access in the Latin American region, like researchers, journal editors, and open access initiatives to let you go our concerns about what I call the next generation

of restrictions. Let me start by highlighting some key facts of the open access model in Latin America. First of all, science produced and published in Latin America has been always open access. Open access has been the natural way in which our scientific communications system works. Second, journals have been supported by universities and research institutions. The majority of them, about 90% of the total number, including the most prestigious journals, are published by public universities. I mean government funded. The third one; historically we have suffered from not having access to science published in the global north due to our lack of economic resources. The last; the tradition of scholarly publishing has not been outsourced to commercial publishers, nor supported by charging authors, ever. I would really like to understand how could the north has let some companies grow in such a way that universities can't control the scholarly publishing enterprise? I wonder if there is any publishing tradition inside the universities of the global north that could have been lost? In that case, could it be recovered? So if we really want to talk about commons, we cannot just change the restrictions from reading to publishing. We cannot just focus our discussions on how companies of the north will continue being profitable. The APC model brings a risk of widening the gap among researchers of different regions in a global scientific conversation, as well as the risk of breaking the open nature of the scientific communication system of Latin America.

>>Martin Eve: Hello, I'm Martin Eve; I'm a Professor of English at the University of London and I'm the CEO of the Open Library of Humanities, which is a collectively funded open access journal publisher with no open access APC charges. I've been asked to tell you what I don't know, and quite frankly, it could fill a library but we have only got a couple of minutes. So, I had a set of key questions that I wanted to put out there. First of those was, in removing APCs, how do we make sure that we keep the visibility of labor? There are things we want doing from publishers: typesetting, copyediting, proofreading, digital preservation, platform [indecipherable], et cetera. If you're not paying for these things directly as an author in a service model, how do we make sure that that labor is still valued and get those things that are important? Where have APCs come from is another thing I don't quite know. It has to do with transition from sales to service models but we're subsuming fixed and sum costs into

marginal and unit costs and assuming that is the best way to proceed in recovering revenue streams. I also want to know, do nonclassical models have scalability limits? We have seen a lot of collaboratively funded enterprises and they work very well but they're not classically framed so you don't pay so that someone else can't have access. And how are those doing well out of APCs at the moment going to respond to what we're doing. Are we going to see aggression from big publishers who are actually managing to supplement their management streams in the present moment. Lastly I want to know how do non‑APC models work within market structures and government imperatives to create market structures? Is there things that we need to do to harmonize the models that we're creating with those structures and how do radical fiscal changes at the current moment affect the type of enterprise that we're trying to create for a better world with scholarly communications. Thank you very much.

>> <mark>Kathleen Fitzpatrick:</mark> Hi, I'm Kathleen Fitzpatrick, of the Modern Language Association. I want to put aside the notion of open access publishing, per se, for a moment and instead focus on the underlying goal of that phrase: getting the knowledge that is produced by those in and around our colleges and universities into the broadest possible circulation where it can do the most good for society as a whole. Because oh my goodness does society as a whole need that knowledge right now. Lots of that work does circulate openly today but not in coordinated, discoverable, sustainable, or even entirely legal ways. So the question that we've been working on is whether we can build a scholarly society managed, researcher governed, not‑for‑profit, interdisciplinary platform for facilitating communication amongst researchers and between researchers and the world. A platform that might provide an alternative to venture capital funded for-profit platforms that have gotten a lot of use lately. Our test bed for exploring this question is Humanities Commons, a federated network of scholarly society sites that are linked by a common identity management system and connected to a shared repository. Humanities Commons will be open very soon - very soon - permitting anyone interested to create an account, to develop a professional profile, to deposit and share work, to participate in group discussions, and to create new publications. But there is a lot left to be done and to be figured out. We have to figure out, as has been said earlier, how to get and keep everyone, not just the open access

aware tech savvy crowd, but scholars of very traditional types as well, involved in using this platform. We have to get institutions to recognize that this is where important work is being done and we have to get organizations: scholarly societies, libraries, foundations, and others, to be willing to support and sustain the platform on scholar's behalf. I'll leave it there. Thanks.

>> Jean-Claude Guedon: Good morning. My name is Jean‑Claude Guedon. I come from Montreal, University of Montreal. My first point is that we have to know how to shape open access. Open access is fundamentally about communication among scientists, among scholars. It is not publishing. It is not a financial problem. It is a communication problem. Humanity deals with reality by having organized a very lovely system distributing intelligence based on communication. The priorities therefore are simple: fit everything else into that imperative of communication and not the reverse. We must think of the communication first. So in particular, let's not immediately start by saying how do we make this durable or as people prefer to say nowadays, sustainable. It is not a question of money that is first. Especially if you want to pay for something you don't know what you're paying for. You have got to know first what open access is about. It is communication. The problem of the open access system right now is simply based on the fact that the whole communication system is fitted into an evaluation system which itself is perverse. It is based on journals. We don't evaluate the work of people. We evaluate where they place their work ‑‑ which is absurd. So, what we have to do is really establish a system of communication which is completely autonomous from the imperatives of journals, from the imperatives of the financing system. And I'll just finish with one thing. Sustainability is often asked of the communication system of scholars. Scientific research has never been sustainable. It has been subsidized for the last four centuries so why shouldn't communication among scientists not be subsidized as well?

>> Lorraine Haricombe: Good morning, I'm Lorraine Haricombe, University of Texas in Austin. I'm going to come from a voice from the global south. My home country, South Africa. Where I would like to use the backdrop of student protests there to decolonize and transform higher education institutions in South Africa as a powerful opportunity to reframe open

access publishing as a strategy for social responsiveness that goes well beyond the African continent. Decolonization and transformation in higher education are key strategies and issues on the agenda of higher education in South Africa and form the foundation of open access policies, practices, and mandates there. Here are some of the issues just to be clear about what I mean when I talk about decolonization. The curricula is still dominated by dominating worldviews, e.g. Western, male, capitalist, heterosexual etc. and the content under-represents and under-values perspective and experiences of those who do not fit into the mainstream categories. The second issue: changing demographics in higher education, like here, in South Africa there has been a massive expansion of higher education across race and class over the last two decades and many of those students do not fit the profile of the mainstream, 18‑year‑old, middle class, white, University ready, high school graduate. This is happening in the U.S., too. The fundamental question is, what is the fitness of the current degree? Relevance to the real world for the global south is another issue. What they know is that open access removes one barrier from the end user to enable access to open content; what we also know is that APCs is hardly affordable to African researchers and therefore limit their access. Librarians and libraries have been at the forefront of advancing the open movement for a while now and some of the libraries in South Africa have taken on that role of publisher to help and to support decolonization of African scholarly literature. They have combined open green and gold access to provide economic institutions with the capacity to probe opportunities to decolonize the materials. I'll stop there.

>> Neil Jacobs: Hi there, I'm Neil Jacobs, (Head of Scholarly Communications Support at Jisc in the UK). I'm speaking today in a personal capacity. We were asked to find a few things that we would find it helpful to know and I have several of those. Firstly, are we basically concerned to establish or perhaps re‑establish academic control over the means of scholarly production? Do we agree therefore that learned societies are one way to operate that academic control? They often do great public engagement work which is part of what we're interested in out of journal subscriptions and APC funds. Do we think that is an issue? I would like to ask what does the future of publishing look like? I would like to join up the conversation about beyond the APC with a conversation

about beyond the PDF so we can take a step forward in both ways. I would like to ask what open access publishing models work outside of the global north? I don't know that myself but people here do. What makes them work and what might break them? And I would like to ask in one possible future, in some disciplines and in some geographies we see researchers and institutes and libraries and funders taking a rather active roll in open access publishing, so what incentives would be needed to reward that sort of work and what other barriers prevent the academic research and information communities from working together to provide collective publishing services at scale? Thank you.

>> <mark>Heather Joseph:</mark> I'm Heather Joseph, the Executive Director of SPARC in Washington, DC. Most or all of us consider ourselves to be part of the open access movement. This truly has been from the start a social justice movement. A group of loosely organized individuals and organizations who have a well-articulated shared concern for changing a specific aspect of status quo. As a movement, we have been working to correct imbalances in the fundamental global system of how we share knowledge and to promote open and equitable access to information in order to serve the public good. As this movement has grown and progressed, it feels to me that it has become ever more critically important that we be able to individually and collectively answer the question, what does success mean to us as a movement? So often, we find ourselves focusing on our own specific individual aspect or interest of advancing open access which is great. That is fine. But I also think that now more than ever, we need to find ways to be more deliberate about picking our heads up and making sure that we're truly paying attention to how the work we're doing individually affects us collectively as a movement. This is particularly critical as we consider making decisions that have profound implications for either replacing or reinforcing economic iniquities in our global community. And so this is a gap that I would like us to think about filling as we work through the next day and a half of conversations together. What actions can we take to truly ensure that our individual efforts are mutually reinforcing our collective progress towards our shared goal of an open and equitable system of sharing knowledge and one that truly does have the public good at heart.

>> **Rebecca Kennison:** I'm Rebecca Kennison (Principal of K|N Consultants and co‑founder of the Open Access Network). As I was thinking about what I would say in my two minutes I was playing with several ideas. What infrastructure would we need to have that is not currently in place? Is there a mixed method for achieving the goal of an expansive inclusive balanced world-wide open publishing ecosystem and if there is, who potentially loses out? How do universities and colleges need to change, including shifting tenure and promotion criteria and what new responsibilities should they take on? These are all important questions that I hope we'll begin to address during the rest of the symposium. I settled on the last one though and jotted down some ideas when I then stopped into the "Uniquely KU" shop at the Oread Hotel. The clerk, an undergrad at KU, asked what brought me to Lawrence and I explained I was here to talk about open access. I was all ready to explain what that meant but his eyes lit up and he replied with gusto: "That's awesome! We need to tear this whole system down and rebuild it from scratch." Nothing I was going to say in the few minutes was going to be anything nearly as radical as that, but inspired by that, that is now what I'm saying. What do we not know about OA publishing that we should? Just this: is the current system so broken that we need to do what that young clerk suggested? Do we need to start over? Let's imagine that we could do that. If we were to build a scholarly communication system from scratch what elements would we keep and what would we discard? I looked at the questions with which I started with this new lens. I realized that thinking about the system, not in terms of coopting - as I had been - but in terms of starting anew, as impossible as that might be in practice, allowed me, and I hope us: the participants here and the participants globally, to think about my questions quite differently. Building infrastructure, adopting mixed methods of paying for publishing, changing P & T criteria; all of these look quite different when you no longer think about coopting the system but rather about tearing this whole system down, rebuilding it from scratch. But that is the work we need to do, because let's face it: if we don't, that young clerk and his friends and his colleagues will.

>> **Mary Rose Muccie:** I'm Mary Rose Muccie from Temple University Press and Temple University Libraries and I'm going to talk about long form scholarship where the questions are legion. So when you talk about

open access for long form scholarship what do you mean? I think this is the first question. The word monograph is used most frequently. But what is a monograph? I asked the press acquisitions editors and director of marketing for their definition of monograph and I got four different answers. If we can't define it within our own press how can we universally define it when it comes to open access? There are slight differences in the definition of monograph for how the term is used in the Crosswick report for HEFCE, and the Ithaka report, OAPEN‑UK report and across publishers in general. It usually doesn't mean course books, but presses like Lever and Athabasca include some course books in what they call monographs. Luminos seems to as well. The AAU, ARO university subvention idea was looking at first books which are tenure books. Why does it matter? Here is what we at Temple ‑‑ this is what our output was for the past four seasons. 7% monographs and 79% course adoption books which are up early level undergrad and grad courses.14% trade. Given that, what issues do we want to address with open access when it comes to long form scholarship? Books, in particular revised dissertations or tenure books reflect years of investment and research. And what is happening in terms of tenure and promotion? Juan's project where he is gathering tenure and promotion policies is essential. What costs should be covered? The Ithaka survey on cost breakdowns showed the average basic cost ranges between $20,500 and $34,700 and the highest cost is acquisition and development by far. How much do we need to make an impact? The Mellon-funded Digital Monograph P&L Builder used to gather staff time has a 15-plus page user guide. There are numerous questions here.

 >> Williams Nwagwu: Williams Nwagwu from the Council for the Development of Social Science Research in Africa, based in Dakar, Senegal. A world without APC/BPC is a world where knowledge is for human problem solving, not exotic research, not [indecipherable] illustrating matters. Where color of skin, race, and language of authors, venue of publication quality of journals ethnicity do not matter in the quality of knowledge produced. Those who produce knowledge define, control access, and manage the knowledge they produce. Knowledge ranking is localized to bring out the best in every community. Where public knowledge is public, the electronic highway is not clogged by fake, dodgy

journals as a result of APC. Free and multidirectional flow of knowledge. What is possible? No supreme roles to the commercial publishers, ask Latin America. [indecipherable] publishers should be clients of research-producing institutions and not vice versa. They should not own or exercise any form of authority over research publications. Knowledge should be produced, processed, and circulated from the locality where they are produced. Barriers. Publishing abroad, dominant in Africa for visibility, is not a global science communication policy and is therefore hegemonic and weakens the quality of science at home and volume of knowledge produced universally. Knowledge produced in and about Africa is therefore absent in Africa. APC creates new enclosures and trajectories. APC is a type of impact factor -- imposing cost and related ranking by base-quality criteria, exercising stress on the economy of African scholars. African economies are incapable of paying APC. What is needed to go forward is to [indecipherable] task of organizing and publishing research. Scholarly publications should be organized, indexed, and ranked locally. Finally what are the next steps? We should come out from this meeting with a Kansas declaration on APC and there should be projects, studies that are commissioned to examine how publication function can [indecipherable] at universities and identify appropriate roles for publishers, according to the levels of development of different communities. Thank you.

>> <mark>Charlotte Roh:</mark> My name is Charlotte Roh and I'm the Scholarly Communications Librarian at the University of San Francisco, where I work at the intersection of scholarly communication and social justice, and am working to integrate both into the everyday practice of librarians. My concern about what I don't know actually extends to what I think the academic publishing community needs to know, which is where biases and injustices exist in the historical publishing structure that we are replicating in these amazing new open access systems that we're creating. We talk a lot about the inequalities of economics and access which of course are very important and there are people at this meeting who know firsthand how the economic demands of publishing are impacting scholarship and I look forward to learning more from them. But I am seeking to know, and I think we should all be asking this question, which is how did these publishing structures come about in the first place? Who are they built to privilege? For example, there are countless studies showing gender

imbalances in published authors, even if fields demonstrate equity in demographics, and according to recent study by Al Greco, 90% of academic publishing professionals are white. Are we in Western academia and Western publishing prepared to acknowledge that our globalism was and is colonialism and give up structures that privilege us? I think this is particularly relevant after the results of the last US election; we like to say, in the words of Theodore Parker, that the arc of the moral universe is long and bends towards justice. But as we can see today, particularly after the events of the last week, there are people in the world committed to injustice rather than justice, racism rather than equality, to building walls rather than sharing commons. And even more tragically, we're willing to accept these inequalities to make things work. I was just challenged this week, in fact, by rhetoric Professor Nicole Gonzalez Howell, who told me that in her circles the kind of language that I enforced as an editor in my previous career is a prestige dialect and power code called standard edited academic English. This is my privilege and my bias, that I value a kind of writing that doesn't necessarily signify quality of content. It was a hard thing for me to acknowledge but now I need to learn more about it in order to let it go. So I ask,what privileges do we have that we need to critically examine so that we can dismantle them to move towards equality and open access.

>> <mark>Michael Roy:</mark> I'm Mike Roy (Dean of the Middlebury College Library) and I'm here to talk about a project I'm working on called the Lever Press. It is library funded digital-first open access monograph press that grew out of the Oberlin group of libraries and is sustained currently by 50 libraries from liberal arts colleges. We have about $1.5 million in funding that support our work through 2020 and produce about 60 titles during this five year period as we embark upon this adventure I have five big questions that I grapple with as we envision a way for our effort to contribute to a broader change in the ecosystem of scholarly communication and I suspect the questions obtained to many of the other projects that we're talking about in the room. First as a membership model. The question I worry about is can we sustain a membership model in the face of on‑going pressure on library collection budgets? In other words, what is the value proposition and price point for our model to be sustainable in the long run. Second has to be in lowering cost. Our per cost title is about $17,000

which includes acquisitions, peer review, production, and distribution. While we enjoy the savings of not to having construct a paywall or to handle sales, other ways that we can lower cost even further to allow our dollars to go further. The third question has to do with blurring boundaries. How innovative can we be in our digital publications? How can we create a more integrated scholarly communication infrastructure that will provide the expressive power to our authors, be accessible for the long hall using appropriate preservation strategies and legible to scholarly communities. I'm going to skip the fourth and go right to the 5th which has to do with the tipping point. If we envision a world where everything is open and there are no longer any costs associated with accessing scholarly journals and monographs, how long can we afford to sustain the these two parallel universes? When will we reach a tipping point where we feel comfortable that the change is under way and open access has won? The way we fund and run our libraries will be very very different in this New World and will require a great deal of retooling in terms of budgeting, staffing, technology, and work flows; when will we be able to actually reinvent ourselves?

>> <mark>Ralf Schimmer:</mark> My name is Ralf Schimmer, Max Planck Digital Library. It is a pleasure to be here in particular as this symposium draws its inspiration from the Berlin 12 conference and OA 2020 initiative as it is put forward by the Max Planck Society. In my capacity as project manager for OA2020 it is perhaps not a surprise when I say that we would not be afraid of APCs. In fact from our perspective it is a bit hard to see how APCs can -- could be fully avoided in an emerging new publishing ecosystem. But on the other hand we can of course also heartily embrace the notion of moving beyond APCs because we see APCs not as the final or only solution to the challenges that lie ahead of us in organizing the cash flow that is needed to finance the publishing services. In any case, what is needed from our perspective is a leverage to bring about open access on the large scale; much more than we have seen so far. We need more dynamics in the system and in particular to be able to liberate the budgets as they are currently locked in the subscription system so that they can be used for financing open access publishing services. In responding to the two questions I would say currently all analytics and discourse is on the subscription side. We need to know more about what is happening on the submission and publishing side. Libraries have to build the capacities to

know more what their patrons do and where they publish. And with the second question I was reminded of a famous saying in architecture: form follows function. I believe we need in scholarly communication to develop this into a system where the money can follow the publishing services as they are requested by the academic communities. Thank you.

>> <mark>Kathleen Shearer:</mark> Hello; I am Kathleen Shearer, the executive director of COAR; we're an international association with members around the world. For the last decade and a half we have been working to achieve open access and I think we have been successful. Kudos to all the people here and many others that have worked so hard. But with this singular focus on open access, as Juan Pablo and others have said, we're at risk of exacerbating an already serious problem of participation through a reliance on APCs so we need to think beyond open access; we need to think about equality. At COAR we're proposing to reposition the institution, the research center, and the library as a foundation of a new scholarly communication system. In this model, the institution takes responsibility for collecting, managing, and providing access to the content created by its community. We then connect those institutions through globally common standards, or globally through common standards, and build value‑added services on top such as peer review.

We already have a large robust network of local journals and repositories on which we can start building this system. In this way we will have a sustainable global system that also supports the needs and priorities of local communities which is absolutely critical. And this addresses both the access and the participation problems that we have. So to accomplish this, I think we need to do a few things. We need to coalesce around a common vision. We need to ensure that our journals and our repositories are interoperable and also we need to change the way we assess quality and impact. We have to reduce our reliance on impact factor. It is a flawed measure. And finally, I think critically, we need to think beyond the journal article and recognize the value of a whole range of valuable materials and products that are produced through research. Thank you.

>> <mark>David Shulenburger:</mark> Hi friends; I am David Shulenburger, I'm Senior Fellow at APLU and Provost Emeritus at the University of Kansas. I want to talk about the incentives to engage in scholarly communication. First four principles. First, a scholar's motivation to publish is derived from the

desire to contribute to better understanding of some topic. Second scholarly work is accepted for publication because it contributes to better understanding of the subject and phenomena it addresses. Third, the beneficiary of the work is the community of students and scholars and ultimately the entire society else the work is not scholarly communication and should not be published. Fourth the incidence of cost of publishing scholarship ought to be on those who benefit from it. Asking the scholar to contribute to the cost of publishing scholarship places the incidence of the cost on the author not the beneficiary. Let me give you an analogy from my paper, "Scholarly Communications is not Toxic Waste": producers of toxic waste generate it because the production process for some valued good produces it as a by‑product. The toxic waste by-product must be disposed of properly; a just society requires the producer to bear the disposal cost. Placing the incidence of the cost of disposing of toxic cost on the producer encourages the producer to minimize toxic waste production. Do we want to encourage scholars to generate as little published scholarly work as possible? Just place the burden of the cost of disposing of it, the cost of publishing on authors and minimization will be the direction of the incentives. APCs place the burden on authors. An effective system of publishing scholarly work will place the cost of publication where the benefit is gained at the societal level.

>> John Willinsky: Hello, I'm John Willinsky. I work with the Public Knowledge Project and I teach at Stanford University. I want to slow things down for one moment. I am the final speaker and I can say to everyone's relief. What I want to address is not what we need to know but what we do know. This is year 20, year 15 of open access. We have been at this for a long, long time. And in light of that I think that we can build on what we know and what we have. I would draw from Ralf Schimmer's work in terms of the money question. We have enough money to make all that we publish and all of the world open access. We need a means and a will for sure but we have enough money. I would build on Michael's point in terms of cooperation. The number of colleges that are coming together to work together whether to publish journals, whether to enter into a publishing/press relationship, whether to share materials, all of those things are crucial to a way forward. How we proceed is by experiment and trial and pilot. We at the Public Knowledge Project are doing that. We're

working on a cooperative model that says if there is enough money what we need to do is reallocate that money. Libraries need to reallocate subscription money to open access and journals need to say we need that money but we will take it on the same terms as the subscription only we will make our journals open access. In that simple straightforward way, it might seem we have a scalability problem but I want to point out one lesson that we have learned at the Public Knowledge Project. We started a little experiment about 18 years ago in terms of building some software open source software to use for publishing and on October 1 we hit 10,000 journals using Open Journal Systems. 10,000 journals that have taken up for us, it was something like a thought experiment and have said "we need an alternative and we're going to use it." Thank you very much.

>> <mark>Kevin Smith:</mark> As John just told you he was the last of our 18 panelists. I'm incredibly grateful to all of you for the wisdom, the provocation of your remarks and for the discipline; you actually did all stick to two minutes pretty close. So thank you very much. Should we thank them? I know our global audience would join if they can.

[Applause]

As I told you at the beginning we're going to take a brief break to rearrange our room to make it more easy to have and to broadcast a discussion. I think we've been given a tremendous amount of material to discuss. So if you will bear with us, we're going to do some rearranging, two to five minutes, we will be back here to have a discussion. So the global audience, thank you for joining us. I have seen some of your tweets. Thank you for participating. We look forward to all of you taking part in a very robust discussion.

End Part 1 video

>> <mark>Kevin Smith:</mark> What we have accomplished here is a very large circle. And I hope for the folks who are watching the livestream, you are all more or less visible. I think we want to begin this discussion by asking our group of 9 respondents to give us their thoughts to tell us what struck them, what they thought was missing, what questions they have or what comments they have. So I think that is probably the best way to start. We'll keep looking for questions via Twitter or on the Google doc and we'll just engage

in a discussion once our respondents have started us off. So I guess, April, you're holding the microphone. Are you the first respondent to respond?

>> April Hathcock: No, I just happen to be holding the microphone, so if anyone wants to kick us off.

>> Joanna Gillette: Joanna Gillette from Allen Press. So I was really struck by Martin's comment about the need to recognize the value of labor and all that goes into scholarly publishing and how we continue to communicate that to the community if we are removing cost at either end of the publishing cycle. And one thing that I thought was missing a little bit from the conversation is the question of accessibility. When we talk about access we're not just talking about the fact that it is out there and free but making translations so that people with various languages can have access to content or making sure that it's accessible for persons with disabilities. So all of those of course usually add cost to the process as well and I think are worth considering.

>> Kevin Smith: I think I'd like to take the opportunity to see if anyone else wants to comment on the response. I think that you have raised a very important question for us: the question of accessibility.

>> Ada Emmett: And you can just raise your hand to signal if you would like to speak.

>> Kevin Smith: We did not expect this would be a shy or quiet room.

>> Ada Emmett: Pretend the cameras aren't here. You're among friends.

>> Rebecca Kennison: Yes.

>> Ada Emmett: Okay, Rebecca.

>> Rebecca Kennison: It was one of the things that we as organizers really found to be important. So several people have noted that the livestream is being close captioned as we are going on. It is very crucial and important to us as organizers to do that. So, yes, thank you for raising this really important issue about accessibility and the language question as well. What about English as the dominant language that we're forcing everyone here to speak now today?

>> Kevin Smith: Martin.

>> Martin Eve: The issue of access beyond readership, I think, ties in with some things Neil and others were saying about new forms of scholarship. But I kind of [indecipherable] that was intersecting with some of my earlier concerns on this. That we have utopian potential in the digital space to

create new forms that have new types of scholarship within them and new reaches of accessibility for different audiences. The challenge is that all of those come with commensurate labor demands. And if we're going to see this as a social justice issue we also have to think about people being paid. Switching to a wholly volunteerist system and asking people to take on more and more labor in order to support those forms - it might be lesser of two evils compared to not allowing people to read it. But it's not something I think that we should dismiss. I don't think it's something that we should take casually. So it's a kind of balance between the supposed abundance and utopian nature of the digital space and the scarcity of our remuneration for forms of labor - and balancing those out seems to me an important challenge if we're going to have new forms, if we're going to think beyond the PDF and beyond conventional audiences.

>> Ivy Anderson: Martin, is that just another way of saying that publishing is more expensive than we assume it is?

>> Martin Eve: It can be. I mean the challenge is you've got enormous entities who are making a lot of money out of scholarly communications with vast profit margins and they're held up as what we want to do away with. On the other hand, you've got university presses who are one lawsuit away from bankruptcy. It seems to me the mission-driven presses are rarely the ones doing very well here, but we have to think about a reallocation of resources across the spectrum. It's been pointed out we have enough resources within the system to do it. But like William Gibson's future, they are just not evenly distributed.

>> Kevin Smith: Jean‑Claude, I think you had a comment.

>> Jean-Claude Guedon: Yes, a couple of comments. The first one about accessibility - I would like to link it to visibility. The problem we face in terms of inclusion for example is that a lot of publishing done, that is communication attempted by scientists and scholars all over the world is simply not visible. It is not because some large indexing companies, simply ignore that kind of work. So when we talk about accessibility, I think that we should immediately say the whole ‑‑ the whole world of publishing should be indexed one way or another. My other comment would be a bit of a reaction to Martin. I don't think the alternative is between the present financial system and volunteerism. I do think that the cycle of research involves publishing. It is not a separate thing. It is simply the cycle of the

research work. If we support research, why do we fret about supporting 2% that the publishing face costs. This is nonsense. We're not here to support and protect some people that are making too much money out of publishing and I'm not against people publishing by the way. But I don't see why we fret about solutions which simply say let's extend logically what we do for research to the whole cycle of research.

>> Kevin Smith: I have been asked from the folks watching the live broadcast to please repeat your name, say your names at the beginning of your remarks. Williams, please.

>> Williams Nwagwu: My name is Williams Nwagwu. The question I've asked is actually a very serious one in Africa where often we are angered by a notion that there is no research going on in Africa. I mean, that is ‑‑ you can find that in journals. Where people ask, are there researchers in Africa? Are there researchers in Africa? It is so annoying. You know that you have done research at home and you have done it abroad. Why is it so? It's because what we do in Africa is not accessible outside. Rather what we have in Africa is an avalanche of knowledge produced elsewhere. That enters into Africa, submerges and swallows, you know, local capacity. What CODESRIA has done since last year is to initiate an African citation index which we completed in September. We are now ‑‑ we have tested the index. It matches the Thompson scientific index and we are now only entering data. In a couple of months, let's say a couple of months, we should be able to have research in Africa that has never gone outside Africa properly organized, in a source where people can have access to them. It is not only a question of translation. Translation is a very expensive issue because we have looked at the issue of translation. It is a question of the political economy of knowledge. Where it does appear that knowledge produced in Africa must be weighed against some criteria. Okay. And it is only those that pass some criteria that find a venue in journals that are elsewhere. The others ‑‑ are never referred to here.

>> Kevin Smith: Thank you.

>> April Hathcock: I'm April Hathcock, Scholarly Communication Librarian at NYU. One thing ‑ there are a lot of things that struck me and I'll talk about more of them later. One thing that struck me was ‑ I think Ivy said this, that mainstream journals still dominate Western scholarship. And as Williams has just said and as I've heard several times from other

colleagues in the global South, the fact is that mainstream scholarship dominates world-wide scholarship. That is part of the colonialism of our scholarly communication system. If you, I guess to call out Juan - the map that he did of the citations. Every time someone says your name, Juan, you look up like oh, someone is talking about me. The - he collected the number of citations that come from different countries in the web of science and he created a map based on sort of the relative number of citations. If you look at that map, Africa, which is the second largest continent both in population and in terms of landmass is a tiny sliver which is absolutely ridiculous. I think that is one of the things that we need to think about when we're thinking about open access and several people touched on this and Charlotte really hit hard on this, too, is thinking about how we can create this new world of open access without replicating the biases that already exist and making sure that we're seeing the work - I guess to pick up on what Martin said about labor, see the work that has already been done. I mean Arianna already told us and Juan told us and other Latin-American scholars can tell us, we have been doing this for a really long time, guys, we have a solution. So rather than in the global North hand wringing and thinking how are we going to do open access and how are we going to pay for it and how are we going to make it work? Let's talk to our colleagues who are already doing this and let's learn from them for a change.

>> Kevin Smith: Brian.

>> Brian Rosenblum: Brian Rosenblum, KU Libraries. My comments really echo what April and Williams and some others have said. As we build, you know, new progressive systems for scholarly communication we don't want to unintentionally replicate hierarchy. Some of this comes from a conversation we had last night, Williams, about flows of information and open access resulting in an avalanche of information, scholarship still flowing from north to south - and not only that, but sort of stemming the flow of local scholarship within Africa or within South America. So thinking about it that way, access is not just about access to read or to write. But it is also access to the ability to control the infrastructure, to set the research agenda, to pose your own research questions that meet local -- local needs. One thing that we talked about last night was this idea of regional centers or moving away from one sort of global vision, because even the fact that we're sitting here in Kansas talking about this is still another way

of inserting ourselves into this - this information flow and keeping ourselves at the center of that. But is there a way to have sort of regional publishing initiatives and regional ways to evaluate impact factors based on their local impact or the local relevance that can then be shared more widely.

>> Kevin Smith: Identify yourself for ‑‑

>> Marc Greenberg: I'm Marc Greenberg. I'm a Slavic scholar here at the University of Kansas. I just wanted to speak from my region of specialization. It's not just a north/south problem but also an east/west problem. I work on a daily basis with scholars in Eastern Europe who deal with many of the same problems. I was struck similarly to April and Brian with some of the remarks that started with Juan's statement all the way to John's, which is that a lot of the models that work for sharing communication already work very well in the south and I would like to suggest that we look at what is being done well in the south and maybe think about adopting some of those practices. The dynamic that I observed quite a bit, particular in setting up two access journals in cooperation with institutions in Eastern Europe which is part of my experience, we found it fairly easy because we weren't burdened initially by the, I think, Western European and American model of the Impact Factor™ but we really just wanted to get our stuff out. And the models for working in Eastern Europe were fairly easy to scale up. The only thing we needed really was somebody with digital repository. The partnership with me and with KU helped to make this a fairly easy model to work with. What I also experienced is the impact factors influenced decision‑makers, administrators, in Eastern Europe institutions so they're kind of torn between this older model that actually works for scholarly communication and the pressure to replicate what seems to work in the North American/Western European model, which is really about, I think, making profit for the for-profit journals.

>> Juan Pablo Alperin: I just want to echo that a lot of those things you said are very much true also in Latin America. The lack of the burden of trying to use the model of the North was something and the desire for visibility is what allowed the OA to emerge. But then there is also the risk. The risk the model that might work in the north as they evolve and change those models, end up creating pressure that might break what is currently working in regions like Latin America. The model that gets adopted in

North American/European context - a new model, an APC model, would work well within this context but it will have a repercussion in other regions of the world as they feel the pressures of a system that is pushing them towards adopting that model as well and moving way from what the current practices are.

>> Musa Olaka: My name is Musa Olaka and I have had the privilege of working in a couple of African countries where open access has slowly started to be implemented. One thing I've realized is that sometimes this discussion of open access tends to take place in the global north. But when you go on the ground in African countries, in many African countries, you find that this discussion is actually missing in our institutions. So when you start from the grass root and we also make these institutions to start discussing about some of these issues, I think we will end up being stronger.

>> Kevin Smith: Thank you. Williams. I'm sorry.

>> Rosario Rogel: This is another question, it's different, but if you want to talk about it.

>> Williams Nwagwu: Okay. Just briefly. I have for quite some years grappled with this issue of visibility. It is not a global science policy issue. It is a Latin American, Asian, African issue. Why do I have to struggle to be visible in America and England? It is an insult on my intelligence. Because I have applied my scholarship across the world and I have distinction. I think this language of visibility we have to revisit it. African scholars should walk to us and walk towards utility, not visibility. You don't have to be strong to struggle to be visible elsewhere in open access era. Whatever you publish -- wherever. It can be seen wherever. And the way I see it ‑ it is an enduring colonial heritage. It is an issue that has to do with decolonization of knowledge. It is an issue that has to do with political economy of knowledge. Because whoever has your knowledge has you in his or her pocket. The best of science in Africa is not yet in Africa. Already the index we have done, is showing that we have got at quite a number of materials. We have said the best of African scholarship is not in Africa - it is elsewhere, because there is a wrong emphasis on visibility. This visibility talked about many factors. One, scholars are poor. They want to be ‑ they want to go elsewhere and do their work, and they want to be invited for conferences, and funders also play a very dangerous role. You write a

proposal, they tell you you have not cited any known authors in the field or the journals you have cited are not in the field. These are crucial issues. We have to balance between the purpose of doing research which is utility and what is actually happening vis-a-vis African scholars struggling to publish abroad.

>> Kevin Smith: Thank you. Rosario. I hate to keep delaying you. Martin.

>> Martin Eve: I want to follow up on some of this. We talked a lot about the success in the global south and elsewhere of open access systems. Why doesn't it work in the global north and what is blocking it? It is history obviously that goes back to colonial legacies, but what has that history constructed that is now stopping us from doing, it because clearly build it and they will come doesn't actually work. We've built many systems in the global north and nobody came for open access. So if we want to see the success of the south replicated elsewhere, what kind of systems of prestige and finance do we need to undo, to stop this network that stops us from actually getting participation?

>> Kevin Smith: Please do tell people who you are.

>> Rosario Rogel: Rosario Rogel. I am from the Universidad Autónoma del Estado de México. I came from Mexico. The journal concept is disappearing. Nowadays readers look for not only articles but also digital objects. And in spite of it we are still creating new journals and running huge journal databases. Are we prepared for the change? Are we prepared for the distribution of pre‑post print objects that are not in relationship with a particular journal? I don't know. I'm making a question for all of you. I mean taking into consideration the imminent developing of national - for example, in the case of Latin America, the national institutional repositories, which ones are the future of big databases that aggregate information? That is my question.

>> Kevin Smith: Anybody want to take that on? Please, Kathleen.

>> Kathleen Shearer: Kathleen Shearer, COAR. I think we are starting to prepare ourselves for going beyond the journal article. At least the institutions are. But we need to put more resources into that and we need to again coalesce around a common vision that these are valuable materials. I would encourage us as a group to try to ensure that that's in our vision, in our conceptual model because a journal article is only one small part of the valuable research outputs that we create.

>> <mark>Kevin Smith:</mark> Rebecca.

>> <mark>Rebecca Kennison:</mark> Rebecca Kennison. To follow up on that and what several people have said - I think for us, limited as we are in the north by strength by our traditions is a real serious discussion about changing the reward mechanisms that we have. What drives this system is hiring, tenure, and promotion that are based on traditional ways of publishing. And all the talk that people have about the three legs of you know - there is also teaching and there is also service. Anyone who has gone through a tenure and promotion process knows that was ‑ I was going to say something ‑ bunkum, you know. And so, without tackling that as a core question, I don't know how then we can get to what might be true in other parts of the world. And I don't know publishing in Africa outside of publishing in South Africa, but there is a whole mechanism within South Africa to support South African work being produced in South Africa that then - it doesn't get to the rest of the world but, in part, because the reward mechanisms are to be published within that environment and there are financial rewards that go to universities to do that. That is also part of the reward system that we need to address. So there are local rewards and there are global rewards and so on. I just want to say ‑ I hope in the next day and a half that we really work on that problem pretty intensely.

>> <mark>Kevin Smith:</mark> I think Jean‑Claude.

>> <mark>Jean-Claude Guedon:</mark> Yeah, this is where why I said that at one point I thought the whole reward system was perverse. When we evaluate the quality of the scholarship by the place where it appears rather than by its intrinsic intellectual value, I think that we make a very bad mistake. It goes even beyond that. I think that we're going to join with the comments that I have heard around here particularly coming from Africa and other parts of the world, Latin America as well. When you submit an article to a journal and you are being pushed by your University to publish in so‑called international journals, the journal itself is in competition with other journals, thanks to the impact factor because it wants to take market shares in the market of ideas. And a journal is a community and factor - so the virtual community with points of interest, points of perception of what is important at a certain moment in history. In other words, a journal favors certain types of questions at certain times of its history. That is part of its strategy to establish its identity. So the person in Africa or Latin America that has to

publish in an international journal has to submit an article that is going to be of some interest to the journal. That article may be depending on the discipline such that it doesn't matter for the originating country and the scholar. But if it is in some domains that are of no interest to the country, the scholar may then prefer to do the work that will go in the direction of getting into the journal rather than following questions that would be of more direct and immediate interest to his environment and to himself perhaps or herself. So the result is that this competition between journals and the judgment through journals ends up acting like a latent global science policy. I think if you want to begin to think about why there are so many neglected problems and some of them very pressing. I constantly remind people that Zika Virus was identified in 1947. We still don't know anything about it? Why? Ebola - how long did it take and so on? I won't go on forever. The reason why there is this is a selection of which problems are important. Viagra is apparently far more important than Ebola. Just put it this way. We have got to think about the perversion system does. It extracts intellectual power out of relatively poor countries to problems that may not be of interest to those countries and it forces a kind of competition which centrally doesn't help the great conversation of science and scholarship.

>> Kevin Smith: I think we have comments from both Kathleen's. Is that right? And then Heather.

>> Kathleen Fitzpatrick: I want to say a little something more about competition and something that I have been hearing a bit lately that has to do with this question of how we shift the reward structure to really reward the values that we hold and that lead us to desire greater open access rather than the values of that turn us toward competition. There is a long history in the U.S. in particular but in the global north more broadly of rewarding in academic reviews, exclusivity. The more exclusive the journal is or the more exclusive the publisher is, the more highly thought of your work must be. Therefore, this is where promotions come from and the more exclusively published the work of a faculty is, the more highly thought of the work of that faculty generally and therefore the prestige of the institution becomes. This is a major problem. It is a major conflict with the stated values of many of those institutions. Particularly our public institutions which understand themselves as operating in the public

service. Of really being there in order to produce knowledge and disseminate it as broadly and openly as possible. We have got to find our way back toward thinking about how all of our processes of publishing, but also of review, of hiring, of rewarding all of the work that we do really instantiate our values rather than instantiate competition. After a great talk with a provost of a large public institution not too long ago who was talking about this particular conflict. The desire on hills institution's part to promote public service as the foundation of what the institution does ‑‑ did. I said well, you know, in your tenure and promotion processes, what would it be to gather the entire faculty, the deans, all of the vice provosts, everyone involved in this process, and say re‑imagine every phase of the review process as if public service were the most important value we hold? How would you shift your understanding of what publication looks like, how would you shift your understanding of teaching and service and the role that they play in this process? And get that conversation going institution-wide and see what kind of policies and processes you might come up with. And his response was that the institution would run the risk of losing its status within the nation more broadly. That is the most dismaying possible response. It is absolutely true and yet until we can get that kind of happening in one institution, we can't get it happening in all of them and it needs to happen in all of them. The institutions need to as well stop thinking competitively with one another about the work that we're all doing because we are all doing it.

>> <mark>Kevin Smith:</mark> We have a list going here, but Kathleen.

>> <mark>Kathleen Shearer:</mark> Kathleen Shearer, COAR. I would like to add to what Jean‑Claude was saying and also respond to something that Kathleen said as well. Just going back to Jean-Claude's discussion about how the international journal system skews science policy in southern countries and I think you can see this also in terms of language. It's a big issue because researchers in the developing world who may speak other languages are forced to publish in English and yet the citizens of that country can't even read the research outputs. So it is a really, really pressing issue that we need to resolve. And just going now to Kathleen's comments, around, you know, we need new impact and quality assessment measures. We're reliant on the impact factor. I would like to ‑‑ I think our only way forward is to do what John said in his 2 minute talk. We need to start pilot projects,

we need to start trying new things and see what gains traction to take us out of the situation that we're in now. That's really the only path that I see for going forward. We can talk about this and we have been talking about it for years but nothing has changed. The only way we can really affect change in this area is trying to get some practical pilot projects on the ground.

>> Kevin Smith: I think Heather.

>> Heather Joseph: So I want to build off, I think, what Jean‑Claude and Kathleen Fitzpatrick both said, which they both said so much more eloquently than I ever could. But I think this notion of the pressure to publish in certain journals resulting in the pressure to publish on certain topics setting de facto policy is a real problem but, in particular, because it ‑‑ it overlaps with ‑‑ it doesn't intersect right now with the values ‑‑ the core values of institutions. It moves us ‑‑ those two things farther out of alignment. The more we work in the open access space, the more we recognize that we're talking about really wanting to implement policies, procedures, a status quo that realigns these practices with the core values of higher education institutions and research institutions. And we're talking about approaching this alignment primarily from the tenure, promotion, and evaluation perspective, which I think it is really important. But I was reminded by a recently appointed assistant professor that that's only one place where these values are articulated and these values -- you can't be expected to perform your academic activities to this particular set of benchmarks if that is the only time that you're hearing about a particular value. And she encouraged us to think about -- in higher education institutions incorporating the value of openness, of sharing, of equity from the minute a new faculty member comes in in the orientation process. We don't talk about valuing open behavior, sharing data, sharing our outputs: when you come in, when you're onboarded. We don't talk about it to our students when we bring them into our institutions and reinforce that this is the mission of the institution -- of the higher education institution. This is a value that we hold. This what is we expect you to do from the minute you walk on to our campus as a student, as an as employee, as a faculty member. We can't start at the evaluation process. We have to start at the onboarding process to do this realignment of values with our practices.

>> Kevin Smith: I think we have comments from Ivy and from April. I do want to note that I have a couple of questions from Twitter and that we have one respondent who has not had a chance to speak yet. So, anyway, let's move on. Ivy.

>> Ivy Anderson: Ivy Anderson. I wanted to follow up on Kathleen Fitzpatrick's point, but this also touches on the thread that has gone since. And someone on the public ‑‑ the comment page asked if any of the members here at this symposium had been at the OSI 2015 or 16 whatever meeting and some of us, I think, have -- and one of the groups that I was involved with was talking about the theme of tenure and promotion and policy was very present in that meeting of course as well. Some of the stakeholders in those conversations are here in this room but others who are important to that will conversation are not in rooms like this. And I think one of the ways to address that kind of issue is to ‑‑ and one of the recommendations that came out of our meetings at that time in that other meeting -- was to initiate a process with some of the major academic associations like AAU, APLU, to ‑‑ and there are some international associations as well in this space -- to convene a discussion around tenure and promotion policies and standards so that it's not an issue within an institution. It's an issue within the practice of that activity within disciplines and across disciplines and I think if you have that kind of cross‑institutional conversation convened by major associations who have convening power for those kinds of conversations both nationally and internationally, that's the place where changes in those kinds of standards can be vetted, can be discussed, and progress can happen. I think that's true also in the issues, Heather, that you were raising as well. It's a different ‑‑ the locus of those conversations should be different and they should be convened by organizations that have standing to convene those very particular kind of activities. And we can influence that because we in this room have connections to those groups. But it's not going to happen within groups like this, which is why we have conversations like that over and over again.

>> Kevin Smith: April.

>> April Hathcock: To piggyback off of what's being said about realigning institutions of higher education with the public service mission -- and then also to sort of think about those of us in privilege. When we have a

problem, it is very easy to assume that that problem is brand new to everyone and when we find a solution we have to come up with the solution. So as I said before, thinking about how open access works in other parts of the world, but also thinking about the fact that, at least in the US, and I know there is an equivalent in other countries -- we have institutions of higher education that are fully committed to their public service mission and that incorporate that into their evaluation. They're called Community Colleges. They do this very well. They've been doing it for a long time. So again, looking outside of our privilege and seeing places where this stuff is already happening and seeing how we can learn from them.

>> Kevin Smith: David Shulenburger. I just introduced you for yourself.

>> David Shulenburger: Thank you. I want to second what Ivy said, that the discussion needs to happen beyond the institutional level. And associations are a good place, but I want to emphasize why it needs to happen beyond the institutional level. Faculty members in any institution will respond to the criteria that their University sets up for promotion and tenure, salary increases, but given that promotion tenure isn't secure within your institutions, you have to respond as a young faculty member to the criteria set up by every other institution. So a change within a single institution is good, but until we get change across all institutions, and these conversations beyond -- well, first this library conversation is terribly important. We would not be where we are were it not for this set of people in this institution pushing the issue -- they've forced dull provosts to pay attention to over time and we'll continue to do so.

>> Kevin Smith: Martin and then Williams.

>> Martin Eve: Martin Eve again. I just wanted to raise a genuine question about where we draw the bounds of what we do when we try to achieve open access strategically. Scholarly communications is integrated with every aspect of higher education. It feeds into what is done and why people behave in certain ways and there are many ills throughout that entire structure. So regardless of whether we see the goals of open access as noble and pursuing projects that can fix aspects of that, where do we draw the pragmatic line between acknowledging that some of these social problems are incredibly difficult to fix and engrained in centuries of tradition that where we're not going to undo overnight versus pursuing strategies

that might achieve open access to research work. And how do we balance that as an ethical demand on our practice in the everyday compromise that is politics and scholarly communications.

>> <mark>Kevin Smith:</mark> Thank you. Williams.

>> <mark>Williams Nwagwu:</mark> I think this is a very interesting discussion we're having because if you have observed that while there is a discussion on how to put down the traditional journal, the medium of journal is rising in Africa and Latin America. And why is it so? You see, the traditional printing approach to publishing didn't really flourish in this area. For instance, publishing really didn't flourish in Africa where you have big publishing companies and so on. And people are finding it easier to use the open access model to publish. I wonder how we can balance between that. I just want to do some [indecipherable] -- sometimes we say international journal. We have had that here. And I wonder what it means? It took me 32 hours from when I entered the airplane until I got here, I'm international. So is the knowledge I produce. If you say international whose face, whose narrative, whose conversation, whose idea? I mean, the world is not a monolithic cosmology -- the world has several cosmologies which we can only come to realize their usefulness if we open up to the world. I like what is happening in the west where there is some cautiousness now that there should be some inclusiveness, okay. You don't have to deal with refugees this way or that way. Seems to say there is an effort to try to deal with the issues of the past. As far as I'm concerned Africans cannot completely, you know, deal with issues that have to do with colonization. Just like I mentioned before. So we have to deal with some of these issues. What is international. What is standard? I mean, when you say south, south. You're dealing with 70% of population, human population or not. What is standard if it excludes 70% of the world's population. What is standard? What is international? If it comes from just a few people, you know. We as scholars have to start addressing these issues. In fact, the worst problems are becoming very overwhelming to the knowledge we already have. I can give you examples. Already we have so many incurable diseases and you see we are supposed to start looking for solutions from all the knowledge systems. We have to open up and forget this, you know, enclosed type of knowledge system which compels us and constrains us to reason in a

certain way. The are other reasoning, you know, typologies. Some of these can contribute in addressing human problems.

>> <mark>Kevin Smith:</mark> Williams, I want to follow up with what you just said and what you said earlier by sharing with you a comment that was sent to us. It's a comment or question I would like to ask you to react to it. It was sent to us over Twitter. The person wrote, "Do northern scholars need to prove how visible they are in Africa? And why is it different?" By the way, I'll tell you the theme of the Twitter questions I have is all about how people can learn from the experiences in the global south. Would you like to respond to that in regard to visibility?

>> <mark>Williams Nwagwu</mark>: Anyway, I think I have answered that question, that northern scholars don't struggle to be seen in Africa because the journals, we buy, we beg to subscribe. We go to funding -- funders to have access to the journals. There is no such struggle. It is African scholars, scholars from the developing world generally that beg to be seen elsewhere, which as far as I'm concerned in the open access era means nothing. I don't know what -- I can go and honor that but I have mentioned that before.

>> <mark>Kevin Smith:</mark> Yes, thank you. John.

>> <mark>John Willinsky</mark>: I appreciate the wealth and richness of knowledge that is being shared about all the different elements of scholarly communication, but I want to make an argument for focus. I want to say that it might be more effective and strategic if we focus on one single thing which is open access. And we say that this is in fact what we're determined to alter and this is within our reach to alter, and all of the other rich and varied elements from impact to visibility to international standards and all of those aspects will be with us and will be something that we can continue to deal with. But unless we come in on this particular element, this one thing that has been within our research and that we have in fact, I think, succeeded at getting to the 50% point. I mean, the research is a little bit questionable in the sense of what counts as a measure and standards. But we have gotten to at least something close to a tipping point. And when you get to that stage when you've had all of the early adopters when you've had all of the breakthroughs, then it takes a very concerted effort to reach the rest of it. That final mile or however you want to frame it. So I would hope that this discussion doesn't limit the range of experience and richness of -- and wealth of experience that we have here. But at the

same time, we say if there was one thing that we could do, one way in which we could move forward the open access agenda, increase the number of journals or the number of books that are available to the world and visible in that sense then I think we would be more effective than trying to address the full range. I appreciate ‑‑ I just want to add much of our impetus behind open access has to do with these larger issues. By all means. And we are intellectually engaged so we want to understand the historical and international elements. We want to see the contributing factors. But at some point we want to say that it is the open access we want to get now. And that we can't lose that. Thank you.

>> Kevin Smith: Thank you. I think that we have Arianna and Jean-Claude.

>> Arianna Becerril: I would like to add something to what Williams had said. One of the successes of open access in Latin America is not only because of the involvement of governments. Governments, as Jean-Claude said, must be involved in the sustainability of science and publishing. However our system, our communication system, has already been affected by the north policies. For example, a researcher is evaluated based on journals indexed in databases that historically exclude Latin‑American journals as we know, Web of Science [indecipherable]. A researcher is always struggling to survive permanently. So I totally agree with Ivy that suggests that discussions have to be taken into an institutional level. For example, in both research consults like in Mexico and Columbia. Maybe you have heard about it. To raise the awareness of this problem in terms of the evaluation in Latin America. So it is not a perfect system. It is always being written by the north policies.

>> Kevin Smith: I want to follow up.Thank you for that. One of our Twitter questions was to ask about how the born OA system in Latin America developed. I think that you helped us with that and you wanted to ask the people who are from Latin America if they wanted to make any further comments about that. If you have a comment.

>> Rosario Rogel: How Open Access works in Latin America?

>> Kevin Smith: And how did it develop?

>> Rosario Rogel: Okay. I think as I told you probably in the meeting in North Carolina, the Triangle Scholarly Communication Institute, probably the open access was born in Latin America. In United States or in Europe they put the name, you know. We started to develop this kind of distribution

since I don't know -- probably almost 20 years ago. At least with CLO --
that was the first big project in Latin America that started with that. This is
because we in Latin America all the journals mainly are made with a public
advance. With public money. Then all of those journals are -- okay.
Storage in their -- I don't know. When it was in paper. It was -- it was in
storage and when it when it start to develop the Internet they start to get
busy. This is because they start to run the open access in Latin America
mainly with the CLO project I think. It was the first one that started with this
development. Yeah.

>> <mark>Kevin Smith:</mark> Thank you.

>> <mark>David Shulenburger:</mark> I wonder if Rosario would add the national laws
that have been passed in various countries.

>> <mark>Rosario Rogel:</mark> Okay. Yeah. In Latin America at least there are three
countries that have national laws on open access. The first one was Peru
and Argentina and Mexico. And last year, no it was two years ago, these
three countries started to develop these federal laws in open access. It's a
little bit difficult and it's not exactly the same in each country, but I think this
is a big support from the government in order to develop the open access
project.

>> <mark>Kevin Smith:</mark> Thank you. Now Jean‑Claude had a comment. I'll come
over to Mary Rose. I want to finish. We're very close to our time. I want to
finish by asking Raym to make any comments he wants to make and I
have one last Twitter question. So I think that's our program. Jean‑Claude.

>> <mark>Jean-Claude Guedon:</mark> I just want to go quickly back to Williams's
remark about why should I want to be seen in the north. But there is even
worse. It is that when you do research project you do a literature search. If
you do it in the north and you miss all the literature that exists elsewhere,
you're never faulted. Why? Oh, it's too difficult to find. So we really need
the indexation, which leads me now to react to John actually. I understand,
John, your concern to focus so that we don't disperse ourselves if we want
some real, practical results out of this meeting. At the same time, I'm a bit
concerned about let's say too spontaneous a vision about open access as
if it is unproblematic. We know what it is. The very problem -- I tried to
raise it in my 2 minute intervention -- the basic problem is what shape OA
do we want? If we end up having OA with $10,000 articles -- APCs -- this,
would be called OA, but to me it is not, it's no longer OA. So you cannot

escape unhappily. I'm really unhappy for you. But you cannot escape the wider questions which involve visibility, evaluation, and things like that. Universities -- I think David said it very well. One university cannot go it alone. Why? Because universities themselves are caught in a competition system which is now ruled by another absurd system: the rankings, the world rankings, which come out of nowhere and people believe in -- and for whatever reason, because it allows to manage. Rankings are power tools. Beware of those that design them.

>> Kevin Smith: Mary Rose.

>> Mary Rose Muccie: Mary Rose Muccie. I just want to respond to what John said because -- you said we were about 50% there. And I would argue we are nowhere near 50% there when it comes to books. I think that there are far more questions than answers. I think that's around, hiring, tenure and promotion. I think that's a disciplinary issue, especially when you're talking about the humanities and qualitative social sciences. I think that we don't have a real understanding of what it is we -- of the publishing process around books that we want to fund and what we don't want to fund. I think we have not decided fully what we want the impact to be. Authors of books write to be read. They write to have an impact on their field. They want to shape their field. I can speak for my press that that is our mission. That we want to publish field-shaking, ground-breaking scholarship. Is that what we want to fund? I hope so. But how are we going to do that and who will do that? I think those questions, the fundamental questions that are starting to be answered and John is right: they're starting to be answered when it comes to journals are still wide open when it comes to books.

>> Kevin Smith: Thank you. Raym was our last respondent and we've waited a very long time. We have about five more minutes before we're going to have two official sort of closing remarks. But, Raym, I wanted to give you a chance to challenge us, pose a question, make a comment.

>> Raym Crow: Okay. Well, what I'd like to do is address the issue of global equity but focusing on the economic viability of the models -- Martin and John and Mike and Kathleen talked about specific projects that all have collective…

>> Kevin Smith: Could you hold your mic up? Thank you.

\>\> <mark>Raym Crow:</mark> …All have collective funding models. And those kinds of models as alternatives to market models align very well with the ethos of the academy and of academic libraries, but we haven't had the traction that we might otherwise expect given that alignment. I think one of the things that we need to do is make sure as we design these kinds of systems-- that we look globally, that we ⁃⁃ makes sense to focus some of them on a particular geographic region perhaps but over time that we build a network system that ⁃⁃ where we test attitudes towards reciprocity and perceived fairness. Again, in each individual region so that we can assemble a well-designed collective network that we can then leverage to the fund, open model, open resources.

\>\> <mark>Kevin Smith:</mark> Thank you. Do we have responses to that? I know there are still some panelists who haven't spoken, if somebody wants to make a comment; otherwise, I have a Twitter question here. Well, I will pose the Twitter question then, which is kind of a big one and we'll see if you want to respond ⁃⁃ Heather, did you have a remark?

\>\> <mark>Heather Joseph</mark>: Listening to the Twitter question.

\>\> <mark>Kevin Smith:</mark> The Twitter question is this: how does the ⁃⁃ I will say the apparent rise or surge of nationalism in the United States, in the context, I think the question is, of our recent election, impact the evolution of open access? Do you all see a political impact on open access both in the U.S. and in the movement to support a more global system? I knew I could count on you, Martin.

\>\> <mark>Martin Eve:</mark> Just one comment. Martin Eve again. Open access in the U.K. had its moment of this a short while back when an adviser to government suggested implementing a national open access policy that would mean that anybody in the U.K. could read work that was published there and call that good enough. I think that is a serious threat to what we want to see in scholarly communications. That was where I think this balance I spoke of earlier between pragmatics and idealism was taken far too far down the pragmatics line. He thought that this was something that could be achieved and that would allow a lot more people to read but it compromised gravely on the global reach of research and the fact that we're global ecosystem. So that's just one example I think we're going to see a lot more of it, especially if we use arguments about taxpayer research being open access. Because, well, we'll just give it to the

taxpayers of our country then, would be what comes as a result of that. I think when you think carefully about the rhetorics we use and how that is going to be appropriated by government policies that are increasingly nationalistic and inward looking.

>> <mark>Kevin Smith:</mark> John.

>> <mark>John Willinsky:</mark> I think that is an excellent question from Twitter and what a good use of Twitter for a change in terms of the political climate. I think there are serious threats to the United States around the results of the current election and president elect Trump's position. Everything on free trade which what is we're talking about in a sense around intellectual property and the work we do as scholars to many White House initiatives in the area of open access. I think what we'll see is a greater impact of publisher lobbyists and probably in areas like extensions of the embargo. I think that we have to be prepared to articulate what it is that we have achieved up to this point and where the public value is in terms of the return on the investment in research and that we have to make it as it were visible on a global scale the contribution that the United States is making and that other countries are making. Because the spread of nationalism is entirely contrary to the spirit of scholarly communication and I think the way that we need to address it is on similar terms of the value proposition, the return on investment. Forgive me for the crassness of it, but I think there are good cases to be made. And my focus on open access as a particular goal as opposed to the larger, broader range of issues that are being raised here is a sense in which it is so clearly communicable. That is that we can talk very clearly about what we are pressing for in terms of its public value. To people's physicians, to their teachers, to their lawyers, their policy makers -- and we can make a case that says in fact this needs to be defended and extended in a way that I think it will come under political attack with the current regime. Thank you.

>> <mark>Kevin Smith:</mark> Heather.

>> <mark>Heather Joseph:</mark> I agree, John, with the bulk of what you've said. I believe that the threats are probably very real, very imminent, and very deep to existing White House initiatives and directives. It is highly likely that we'll see some deep and quick pressure on those types of initiatives. I think it's important for us to also recognize that the issue of open and open access in the United States has traditionally been a bipartisan supported

issue. This is a non‑traditional administration coming in, an atypical administration coming in so we don't really know exactly how things will go. And I certainly am kind of forcing myself to say that there are also opportunities with any new change of administration. But here I do think that there are opportunities and you started to articulate the notion of how we approach and how we frame the narrative about the benefits of opening up access to and continuing to open access to information in the U.S. -- and certainly the return on investment narrative is very important. I do think, Martin, your example of the danger of talking too much about taxpayer access is certainly a cautionary tale but I do think we have to think about the kind of narrative that will resonate with the type of policy makers that we have in office. I would say that we're going to see more discussion in the U.S. of taxpayers given the emphasis of this particular incoming administration versus the current administration. There are definitely dangers of overstating the dangers of sharing and I think this is where we as a community are going to need to think long and hard and work together about being able to build the right responses to why sharing information, sharing data, sharing research, sharing educational materials, strengthens us individually as a nation and collectively also a society versus weakening us when we give things away. And that is something that again as we think individually about our projects and the work that we're doing, if we could develop a strong common language on how we communicate about this I think that we'll be able to weather the ‑‑ weather any storms that might be in our port.

>> <mark>Kevin Smith:</mark> I hope you're right. We have two people who are going to do summations for us. As good as this conversation has been I think that we need to cut it off. I did see, Charlotte, that you had your hand up and I would like to give you the last word.

>> <mark>Charlotte Roh:</mark> I want to say -- sort of push back against, I think John's point, that nationalism is contrary to the idea of open access. That goes back to my original statement that we have historical structures in place. As Martin mentioned, what can arise in this kind of environment is that open access then becomes a tool for nationalism as academic publishing has historically been a tool for nationalism in many places and still now. So I think that is something that we need to consider, that open access can be

-- has already been and can be co-opted to push forth certain nationalist agendas.

>> <mark>Kevin Smith:</mark> On that rather cautionary note, I think we'll invite our two respondents, Bob and April, I believe, are the two who get the, I guess I'll say enviable, chance to sum this up because there has been so much richness here. Please would you come up to the front. Maybe the best thing is for them to share the lapel mic or I'll give up the lapel mic that I have on now.

>> <mark>Bob Kieft:</mark> We agreed that April would speak first.

>> <mark>April Hathcock:</mark> What a great conversation. And I'm really excited to be here. I think what I want to do in place of -- and maybe this is a part of a summation but rather than try to give a summary of what we discussed, I think I want to talk a little bit about where I -- you know, sitting on the side, where I see us going with this conversation. One thing that I think I have to say in full disclosure is I'm not someone who is afraid of conflict. And I'm not someone who is afraid of questioning things. And I'm not someone who is afraid of walking back and forth between the line of pragmatism and idealism. I'm not afraid of being unfocused. I'm not afraid of engaging the big problems. And I would encourage all of you to consider not being afraid of those things either, because I think that too often in these conversations we tend to opt for the more -- we use a lot of words like universal and global and international and common and we don't define them. We decide, you know, everyone agrees on this or I think that we all agree on that. And we've heard that in here already. And the fact is not everyone agrees on this. We don't all agree on that. Even in this room we don't all agree on what the benefits are of OA or what exactly OA is or how we think that it should operate. And I don't think that is a set-back. I think that is actually an opportunity. I think that is actually a plus for us. So rather than trying to avoid those differences, rather than trying to avoid those sticky place where we don't all agree, I think that we should take this time to engage them. Too often when we have these conversations, we don't engage them and we end up coming out with a narrative that is dominated by the people who think that we all agree. And then there is silence from the people who realize that we don't all agree. So I would definitely encourage us in these conversations to engage on those places where we differ because I think that is where we move forward. That is where we

make a real difference. That is where we make a real change. And in that spirit I would kind of like to kind of shift sort of the title of what we're doing. I don't think of this, based on the conversation we've had so far, as envisioning a world beyond ABCs/BPCs, but this is really we're talking about envisioning a North American/European/Western/mainstream scholarly world beyond APCs and BPCs -- because as has already been demonstrated, there are places where they've moved beyond APCs/BPCs; in fact, they've never engaged with that to begin with -- and we need to acknowledge that. What we're here to solve is not a global problem. It's a problem in Northern America, it's a problem in Western European, it's a problem in the Western world. It is a problem, but it's not a global problem. Everyone in this room, it's not everyone's problem. Even if we are looking to everyone in this room to help solve the problem, let's go ahead and own what is our problem and what's not our problem and let's be very careful about the definitions we make. Let's be careful about the words we use. Making ‑‑ being certain and being careful about the fact that not everyone agrees and not everyone is coming from the same place and not everyone is in the same place. But we can use that and move forward together from where we are.

>> Bob Kieft: Well, I was going to do a more traditional ‑‑ perform a more traditional attempt at highlighting aspects of our discussion. I think, however, Heather has posed ‑‑ April, excuse me, has posed a set of questions that are more interesting and productive than the list of highlights that I was going to suggest. So heed what she says.

>> April Hathcock: Is it lunchtime? I have been up forever today.

>> Kevin Smith: Yes, it is lunchtime, April. It is almost lunchtime. All that remains is for me to say thank you. This has been an astonishingly rich conversation. You have challenged us. You have lived up to the expectations that Ada especially set when she began to think about this. I think it is really important that we thank Ada and Josh and Sean from our scholarly communications department for the incredible hard work that they put into this. We have about a dozen other librarians that I'm not going to name who have been working behind‑the‑scenes. I want to make sure that they get acknowledged but mostly thank you all so much who took part and all of you who took part around the world. We appreciate your Twitter comments. We appreciate your contributions to the Google doc. I

am looking forward to the -- to where we go from here because I think that you have given us a lot of directions and a lot of things to think about.

Thank you all very much and good afternoon.

[Applause]