

Google Groups

Re: univ of washington

jmmason

Mar 11, 2019 12:38 AM

Posted in group: **The Open Scholarship Initiative**

The UC doesn't have an agreement with Elsevier, Glenn, so you can't mischaracterize it.

What you tweeted was that "researchers will no longer be able to read many leading journals". Surely you know that there are many avenues to reading the articles in those journals, most legal, some illegal: subscriptions are only one pathway. Going without a subscription does not prevent researchers from reading, it merely makes it less convenient in various ways. *No* US university subscribes to all scholarly journals, but yet through alternative channels scholars are able to gain access to the articles.

We have published advice to our scholars on how to gain alternative access; see e.g, <https://osc.universityofcalifornia.edu/open-access-at-uc/publisher-negotiations/alternative-access-to-articles/> (every campus also has its own local version of this; see, e.g., for Berkeley, <http://www.lib.berkeley.edu/about/uc-elsevier/alternative-access>).

As to impact, you might look to the scholars in Germany and Sweden (combined, substantially more than in the UC): they have not had a contract with Elsevier for some time and their ScienceDirect access to the journals was shut off 8 months ago. The sky has not fallen.

Telling scholars "will no longer be able to read many leading journals" is irresponsible.

Jeff

Jeff MacKie-Mason
University Librarian
Chief Digital Scholarship Officer
Professor, School of Information and Professor of Economics
UC Berkeley
www.jeff-mason.com



150
YEARS
OF LIGHT

On Sun, Mar 10, 2019 at 8:03 PM Glenn Hampson <gham...@nationalscience.org> wrote:

Hi Jeff,

I apologize if I've misunderstood the UC agreement. You and Ivy are the experts here. Please do share the correct interpretation if you're willing.

But since you raised this topic (and since we ruminated about this on the list last week) I'll ask: What do you mean when you say that UC researchers "will need to access that [Elsevier] content through other means, which will be somewhat less convenient." Do you mean they'll need to buy their own subscriptions? Look for free copies on ResearchGate or SciHub? Ask for copies through interlibrary loan processes? With a system the size of yours, you must receive thousands of information requests a day for Elsevier content. How is this going to be channeled (and I'm assuming "for free" as well since cost-control seems to be the underlying imperative here). If you've modeled the demand numbers---where you expect these requests to go, how many will be fulfilled, how many won't be fulfilled, what the resulting budget hit will be, etc.---they would be really interesting to see.

Thank you,

Glenn

Glenn Hampson
Executive Director
Science Communication Institute (SCI)
Program Director
Open Scholarship Initiative (OSI)



From: osi20...@googlegroups.com <osi20...@googlegroups.com> **On Behalf Of** Jeffrey MacKie-Mason
Sent: Sunday, March 10, 2019 7:09 PM
To: Glenn Hampson <gham...@nationalscience.org>
Cc: Ivy Anderson <Ivy.A...@ucop.edu>; Dempsey,Lorcan <demp...@oclc.org>; The Open Scholarship Initiative <osi20...@googlegroups.com>
Subject: Re: univ of washington

Good grief, Glenn. First, UW didn't propose anything like Plan S. What they said *they* were pursuing (last paragraph) is "we stand in support of finding new pathways to build and negotiate transformative models that create collaborative and sustainable long-term solutions." That's pretty bland (and sounds an awful lot like the mission of OSI).

Second, your critique is not only inapt, but carelessly incorrect: "Proposing that UW researchers will no longer be able to read many leading journals will not help research." Not only did they not propose that, but that is not what the UC action (which they comment on) did. Terminating our contract with Elsevier does not mean UC researchers "will not longer be able to read many leading journals." It means that they will need to access that content through other means, which will be somewhat less convenient (for the articles Elsevier has already open, no less convenient; for the many that are available in pre-print archives, minor inconvenience; etc.). It is inflammatory and wrong for *you* to suggest that UC researchers will not be able to read that content.

Jeff

Jeff MacKie-Mason

University Librarian

Chief Digital Scholarship Officer

Professor, School of Information and Professor of Economics

UC Berkeley

www.jeff-mason.com



150
YEARS
OF LIGHT

Google Groups

Re: univ of washington

jmmason

Mar 13, 2019 3:30 PM

Posted in group: **The Open Scholarship Initiative**

Glenn,

Sorry for not replying sooner, but I've been buried with inquiries.

On Mon, Mar 11, 2019 at 9:59 AM Glenn Hampson <gham...@nationalscience.org> wrote:

What I hear you saying is that UC researchers will be fine without Elsevier access because they'll get this elsewhere. And you have a roadmap for access. Correct?

I thought my response in the prior message was pretty clear: "Going without a subscription does not prevent researchers from reading, it merely makes it less convenient in various ways. *No* US university subscribes to all scholarly journals, but yet through alternative channels scholars are able to gain access to the articles." And we've published the roadmap and it has been widely advertised by us, the Twittersphere, etc.; here's the Berkeley version (all 10 campuses and the President's website have a version of this): <http://www.lib.berkeley.edu/about/uc-elsevier/alternative-access>.

We all deal with getting access to articles for which we don't have subscriptions for faculty and students -- it's part of the regular daily business of research libraries. The only new wrinkle here is scale.

I did *not* say "UC researchers will be fine". I said it will be less convenient in various ways. How much inconvenience depends on the article. (And to be clear, I'm not trying to minimize the pain: "inconvenience" will generally be time or money, and both *matter*. My point is that researchers *can* read the articles they want which you in your initial incorrectly said they could not.)

Consider: Authors or their institutions already pay APCs on a non-trivial fraction of Elsevier articles: those are immediately available at no additional inconvenience (time or money) for our researchers, even without a subscription. (We still have a license for the Science Direct *platform*.)

Next: Article not open access at Elsevier. Copy the DOI, pop it into Unpaywall (if you have the browser extension installed you don't even need to copy-and-paste: the extension checks all DOIs automatically), and for another large fraction of articles it will tell you it's available (perhaps in author accepted manuscript form) and give you a link. That could be a delay of somewhere between 5 and 60 seconds. Not so much inconvenience. (Doing a search by title and author on Google Scholar will usually lead to the same result in the same amount of time.)

Next (of course the order can vary): Put in an ILL request. In our library catalogs, the search for an article will automatically deliver you to a page that lists a variety of options, depending on what our discovery engine knows is available. One of those options is requesting the Library to obtain it for you. Most well-formed ILL requests can be processed automatically (or quickly if human intervention needed), and since most article ILLs are delivered electronically from the lending library, the requests frequently are fulfilled in as little as 1 hour; in some cases delays can be 1-3 days.

If there is a more urgent need, and the request meets the Library's guidelines for this service, it can be purchased from a distributor (which pays the required copyright fee to Elsevier): document delivery fulfillment, once the request is processed (which in some cases may be automatic and instant; in other cases may have a modest delay for human mediation, like ILL) typically takes a few minutes. (And readers who are really desperate have another option, if they wish: they can purchase the article directly from Elsevier on the Science Direct site. We're not encouraging readers to do that, but it's an option some utilize.)

There are other channels as well: email the author. Search Academia.edu or ResearchGate. Etc.

Because of the last resort option of buying the individual article, it is **always** possible to get access, and quickly. It is very often possible to get the article at no additional charge, sometimes quickly, sometimes with a delay that might range between an hour and three days.

You've also been asking if we've done quantitative analysis. Yes and no: as I think I said elsewhere, we have experience at all of this (every library does) but not at this scale, so we don't have data to answer the specific questions you raise for Elsevier articles. But we will be collecting that data. You said the Germans and Swedes may not have enough experience yet, but they have a lot more than we do (over 8 months), and they have been reporting initial experiences at meetings and at least one conference. (Before you ask, I have learned of these reports through direct communications; I wasn't present, and don't have their materials to distribute: approach them.)

Jeff

Jeff MacKie-Mason
University Librarian
Chief Digital Scholarship Officer
Professor, School of Information and Professor of Economics
UC Berkeley
www.jeff-mason.com



150
YEARS
OF LIGHT