Principles for a combined collections and publication budget

Background:
Currently there are two separate budgets, for Subscriptions and Research.
- Subscriptions pays for the right to read content.
- Research pays for the right to publish content.

The cost of a ‘Read and Publish’ (‘R&P’) agreement is currently split between the two individual budgets. Each contributes to the cost based on the spend level at the point the deal is created.

At the outset, the proportion for paying to Read is much larger than the proportion paying to Publish, as we’re paying much more for subscriptions than we are for publishing.

As Read and Publish agreements progress, the cost ratio is shifted, until proportion paid to Publish is much larger than the proportion paid to Read. The total cost should be stable. So, a typical (idealised) transition over several years of a Read & Publish agreement might be:
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Proposal
Create a new “Read and publish” budget, using funding from the existing Subscriptions and Research Budgets; while retaining the independent Subscriptions and Research budgets:
Rationale for the combined budget:

- Demonstrates commitment to achieving Plan S principles
- Streamlining financial planning
- Administrative efficiency of budget
- Single negotiation process leading to efficiencies of time
- Stronger process ready for next round of ‘transformational’ deals
- Manage the financial implications of the transition from paying to subscribe to paying to publish - the budget also takes a transformative approach as money is re-assigned as and when individual R&P deals are established.
- Costs that are not directly impacted by the transformative agreements (e.g. non-journal subscription content, and non-R&P publishing costs) retain separate budgets.
- Clarity for monitoring of transformative deal participation, costs and performance.
- Ensures adequate funding to support both Read & Publish agreements and other subscription content and publishing costs.
  - Transparency over spending in the different areas (subs / R&P / research)

Benefits:

- Alignment to LMG’s Aims and Aspirations document
  - Maintain excellent collections that support Research, Teaching and Learning
  - Funder aspiration to achieve full and immediate Open Access
  - Fairness and Equity for all who wish to access the content

- Financial transparency: financially efficient use of public funds
  - Ensure we provide value for money for our University by scrutinising content and publishing deals and avoiding over payment
  - Repurpose current funding to not only provide research content to aid research but to support our researchers to publish openly
• Support current transitional deals where OA and content meet our needs
• Support new models of publishing
• Work with agencies and bodies such as JISC to ensure agreements with publishers meet the needs of our researcher communities.
• Advocate for a move to new business models.

• Benefits to wider economy and society
  o Maximise research impact
  o Improve reach of research
  o Help to provide evidence for impact
  o Improve reputation for researchers and their host institution through increased citations
  o Improve quality of research through open, transparent and reproducible research practices

Principles for assessing Read & Publish (“transformative”) deals

1. Deals should ideally be cost neutral or see reduced costs, and at the very least see minimal cost increases. Where total costs of nationally negotiated deals are viewed as unjustifiably high, we will pursue direct negotiation with a publisher for an alternative option.
2. The “publish” element of read and publish deals should be uncapped, ensuring 100% of Liverpool-authored papers are open access. If a cap is implemented, preference will be given to deals where we are confident that the cap will cover likely publishing activity, based on previous years’ patterns.
3. The “Read” element of read and publish deals should allow for post-cancellation access rights for all titles, and be flexible enough to allow us to select an appropriate collection size, or allow us to drop low performing titles wherever possible (depending on model used).
4. Wherever possible we will look favourably on read and publish deals offered by smaller academic and scholarly society publishers, to encourage a move to open access publishing across the spectrum, and not only with the dominant players in the field.
5. The read element will also be assessed using the principles in place for assessing read-only subscriptions.

Principles for assessing brand new models of “publish” deals with OA publishers

1. Patterns of previous publication must be taken into consideration with larger deals, such as those offered by PLoS.
2. Where budget allows we will seek to support APC-less publishing initiatives such as Open Library of Humanities, PeerJ, and others, where costs are clearly tied to the publishing services received.

Principles for paying individual publishing charges

1. Given financial constraints, the desire to shift the publishing landscape, and to ensure alignment with upcoming and likely funder requirements, we should only fund APCs in fully gold journals.
2. Notwithstanding the above, we will pursue transitional/transformative Read & Publish deals where they offer value for money and a clear path towards full open access.
3. We should no longer pay page or colour charges (even if associated with open access APCs). Note that if we adopt principle 1 above, we’re unlikely to see many charges anyway.

Principles for assessing read-only subscription deals

1. Annual price increases should be within acceptable parameters based on local budget changes.
2. The publisher or vendor should have a transparent pricing policy.
3. Options for purchasing that meet institutional requirements; if not we will pursue negotiations directly with the publisher directly for alternative collection or title options, rather than take nationally-negotiated deals.
4. Utilise sector consortia agreements to create efficiencies and ensure value for money in servicing, access and licencing.
5. If there are multiple collection options (e.g. full versus subject specific) consider which best meets LMG needs
6. Support a move to the ‘database’ model for collections, over the ‘core titles plus access-only titles’ model, in order that transfer-in and transfers-out are accommodated within the regular annual pricing, and post-cancellation access applies to all titles.
7. Post cancellation access rights to the licensed material should be included and allow us to drop low performing titles wherever possible. Post-cancellation access rights to all licensed content are preferable to PCA for “core titles” only.
8. Content should be sufficiently different to other content already subscribed to or owned by LMG (in breadth of titles and title coverage).
9. For renewed agreements, cost per use of the subscribed content should compare favourably with the traditional cost of ILL.
10. The licence agreement should meet LMG’s Authorised User definition.
11. The content and host platform should meet LMG’s requirements for authentication, and accessibility.
12. The platform should provide COUNTER compliant usage statistics.
13. With the support of Academic Liaison, consideration is given to how deeply the content is used in teaching and/or research, if significant levels of the content are on reading lists, and whether it is required for course accreditation