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Quality and peer review
Most scientists regarded the new streamlined peer-review process as “quite an improvement.”
The elephant in the room...
General issues - a sample

Increase in academic output: more things submitted = more things requiring review

Academics arguably have less time to offer for Peer Review

Very focused in what they feel able to comment on

Lack of consistency

Peer Review means different things to different people and across different disciplines. (Or does it...?)

Increased networking and sharing of work has made it more difficult to hold a double blind process
Alternative models

Open review

Credit/payment for review

Requirement to review

Post publication review/articles reworked as live new versions with a final paper produced at the end of the process - difficult for monographs

Review as a collaborative conversation

Most academic feedback is that the traditional model still conveys the greatest quality and is key in considering a publisher
OA/New Press specific issues

Why would an academic review for us and not OUP, if time limited?

Why would an academic review for a press with so few live publications?

Time consuming process for resource-lite startups

Do academics not engaged with OA see providing reviews for OA publications as important?

Need to be demonstrably transparent and rigorous to overcome doubts about quality in OA, in a way that is just assumed for other models.
... a traditional approach
Commissioning Process

- Initial enquiry from author/editor to assess WRUP as potential publisher
- Formal submission for project received
- Single blind peer review process- peer review, response from author/editor to comments
- Commissioning discussion by academic-led Editorial Board
  - Potential reworking/resubmission of proposal;
  - Possible further round of peer review
- Commissioning decision from Editorial Board

If commissioned...
→ Commissioned author/editor produces final manuscript
→ Final manuscript is peer reviewed
→ Author/editor responds to/edits in response to feedback
→ Editorial Board approves the project to move to production
→ Author/editor works with WRUP to select production services: e.g. copyediting, proofreading, indexing, chapter level DOIs
→ Project moves to production
→ Finished volume available from the publisher website:
  → free to read online and download in a range of formats
  → available to buy in print using the print on demand option
“Public” book reviews

These are also key in establishing quality - both of scholarship and for new OA presses of output.

Issues include: format, visibility, price (lack of), assumptions about the audience, out of date views of digital (not specifically OA) publications.

Reviews are key to dissemination, reception, reputation.

There can be inconsistent reliance on press brand, and on the author’s network and name that can favour established presses and academics.
Licencing and copyright
Two parts of Open Access
Straightforward?
Straightforward?

But online stuff has always been free through the library…
Straightforward?

But online stuff has always been free through the library…

Does that mean print copies have to be free too?
Straightforward?

But online stuff has always been free through the library...

If it’s free, people won’t value it...

Does that mean print copies have to be free too?
Straightforward?

But online stuff has always been free through the library…

If it’s free, people won’t value it...

But what is to stop people just downloading it and sharing it with their friends…?

Does that mean print copies have to be free too?
Compliance vs culture
Journal OA solutions are unhelpful in monograph context

Act on acceptance not a valid monograph model—creates a barrier to understanding.

Very easy for academics to see OA compliance for journal articles as an extra part of the traditional publishing process. This achieves compliance but doesn’t create an OA culture that engages with the full benefits and possibilities of OA.

Need a cultural shift from stick of compliance to carrot of benefit. Not “You have to!!” but “Look what happens if you do!”
Share, reuse, build!
The challenge

To reset the conversation and reframe in terms of benefits of OA for academics, their institution and the academy as a whole:

Impact  Outreach  Relevance
Visibility  Value  Influence

By making things open, research can live all it’s possible lives- combined data sets leading to new findings, faster outcomes building on existing research instead of repeating things, enabling interdisciplinary and cross cohort working.
Why would you choose a dissemination model that confined your research and limited it to your known peers instead of having the potential for global influence?
Creative Commons Licences are built from several elements. They allow the author to retain copyright of their work, and to choose the way their work is shared and used.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CC-</th>
<th>BY-</th>
<th>NC-</th>
<th>ND-</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Creative Commons Licence</td>
<td>The author must be credited when others share or reuse their work</td>
<td>The work can only be shared and reused for non-commercial purposes</td>
<td>The work cannot be altered, transformed or built on</td>
<td>The work must be shared under the same licence as applied to the original</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Author support

Information for journal editors

- Proposal process:
  - Submission
  - Peer review
  - Editorial Board decision
- Commissioned journals:
  - Contractual process/Open Access licensing
  - Initial set up
  - Advice on journal structure and policy
  - Creating relationships with authors
- Live journals:
  - Ongoing operation of the journal
  - Third party permissions, including images
  - Marketing

Information for monograph authors

- Proposal process:
  - Submission
  - Peer review
  - Editorial Board decision
- Commissioned monographs:
  - Contractual process/Open Access licensing
  - Third party permissions, including images
  - Guidelines on putting your final manuscript together
  - Design and layout
  - The production process
- Published monographs:
  - Marketing and book reviews
320 rue St Jacques

The Diary of Madeleine Blaess

Wendy Michallat

In November 1939 Madeleine Blaess, a French-born, British-raised student, set off for Paris to study for a doctorate in Medieval French literature at the Sorbonne. In June 1940, the German invasion cut off her escape route to the ports, preventing her return to Britain. She was forced to remain in France for the duration of the Occupation and in October 1940 began to write a diary. Intended initially as a replacement letter to her parents in York, she wrote it in French and barely missed an entry for almost four years.

Madeleine's diary is unique as she wrote it to record as much as she could about everyday life, people and events so she could use these written traces to rekindle memories later for the family from whom she had been parted. Many diaries of that era focus on the political situation. Madeleine's diary does reflect and engage with military and political events. It also provides an unprecedented day-by-day account of the struggle to manage material deprivation, physical hardship, mental exhaustion and depression during the Occupation. The diary is also a record of Madeleine's determination to achieve her ambition to become a university academic at a time when there was little encouragement for women to prioritise education and career over family life.
“Open Access is perfect for the translation as this enables the mobility and accessibility of the text and make it particularly suited as a teaching resource. I will use it as a teaching resource on cultural history courses at the University of Sheffield.”

Dr Wendy Michallat
Editor & Translator of
320 Rue St Jacques: The Diary of Madeleine Blaess
Madeleine Blaess (1918-2003) was born in Alsace-Lorraine, France. When she was an infant, her parents moved to York in England and Madeleine was schooled at the city’s Bar Convent and at the University of Leeds from where she graduated with a first class degree in French in July 1939. Britain and France declared war on Germany in September 1939 but Madeleine was determined that her plans to study for a doctorate at the Sorbonne in Paris would not be disrupted and she sailed from Folkestone on the 31st October 1939.

In the Spring of 1940, the German army invaded Belgium and France and Madeleine’s escape route to the channel ports was cut off. She fled to the south of the country together with the thousands of Parisians and finally returned to the capital in July 1940. In October 1940 she registered at the Sorbonne to continue the second year of her doctoral programme and it was then she began to write her diary which, initially, she writes as a letter to her parents to replace the letters she could no longer send to them.
3rd Party Rights and Permissions
Another elephant in the room...
The myth

“You can’t publish anything OA that needs to use 3rd party content. It’s just too difficult. No one will let you use their content in this type of publication. This rules out many Arts and Humanities subject areas that would publish monographs.”
The myth

“You can’t publish anything OA that needs to use 3rd party content. It’s just too difficult. No one will let you use their content in this type of publication. This rules out many Arts and Humanities subject areas that would publish monographs.”

This has not been our experience. OA publishing is not different than any other model when it comes to using 3rd party content. You agree a licence and use the content as agreed, with the required rights statement and credit line.
Hooray!
Not Hooray...
Challenges remain ...
Author related

“But I found it on the web so I can use it”

“I’ve used it before - no one minded.”

“Why can’t I use it? - it’s my image!”

“I used it in my thesis…”

“I’ve never asked for permission to use things before.”

“But it’s out of copyright!”

“I’ve used it before - no one minded.”
Some are amazingly engaged and understand OA as a viable publishing model. When linked to a not-for-profit approach, they often waive or cut licencing fees.

There is inconsistency. Other [some large, institutional] rights holders show:

- Fear of/lack of engagement with digital publication
- Outdated requirements that make the content unusable online even when licenced
- Inability to move on from a print run model that requires number of copies
- Lack of consistency in their own reuse statements
None of these are OA issues
OA issues
OA publications are by their very nature accessible. Higher risk if content used without correct permissions.

OA still new to authors and they may need help expressing the nature of the publication to the rights holder, especially if e.g. having to work with restrictive institutional policy and process.

OA presses may be asking authors to engage with this process in a way they haven’t before. This can lead to author frustration if not handled carefully, and to the perpetuation of the myth that 3rd party content is an issue for OA.

A specific advocacy piece would be beneficial in this area, targeting rights holders and linked to the move towards OA. Led by a body committed to supporting OA, academic publishing, HE and research...??
● Help authors identify the source of 3rd party content and who owns the use rights, if applicable
● Help authors understand what any licence they agree needs to cover before they approach rights holders
● Advise authors to keep a list of images they want to use from the start, including where they came from. Links to online records/catalogue entries/image libraries are the way to go
● Authors should approach rights holders as they are likely to be charged less for the same licence than if the publisher approaches
● Query conditions and fees you don’t think appropriate
● Keep extremely good records of licence conditions
To conclude

There is a great opportunity for advocacy around OA monographs to counter the view that OA publishing struggles to deal with issues that actually impact on academic publishing across the board.

OA does face specific challenges but tackling the broader issues would go a long way in helping address these, and help remove perceived barriers to OA publishing.
Thank you
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