



SCOAP³ at the University of California

Ivy Anderson
Director of Collections
California Digital Library
ivy.anderson@ucop.edu

February 29, 2008
Berkeley, CA



Outline

- Why support change?
- Why SCOAP³?
- UC decision process
 - SCOAP³ evaluation
 - Funding commitments



Why Support Change?

- Current system is unsustainable
 - Increasing research output, not enough \$\$\$
 - Average increase in UC materials budget, 2001-2008: 1.62% per year
 - ejournals = >60% of UC shared materials expenditures and growing
- Digital revolution creates new opportunities
 - New paradigms
 - New economies
- Inertia: Major stakeholders have vested interests
 - Publishers, authors, societies
 - Libraries also suffer from inertia
- Experimentation requires institutional and political will
 - Entails uncertainty
 - Disrupts the status quo
 - Can lead to new, stable structures



Why Support SCOAP³?

- Non-disruptive to authors
 - insulates authors from change
 - Supports the existing credentialing process
- Research-centric
 - Focus on publishing as a service to scholarly production
 - Supports development of global e-science infrastructure
 - Research outputs available for aggregation, re-use, data mining...
- Funding consortium
 - Potential to aggregate support from multiple sources
 - Market-based approach
 - tender process



UC Decision Process

- Ten campuses + CDL
 - 9 Carnegie Research Intensive
 - 1 Medical School-Only campus
 - 209,000 students
 - 170,000 faculty and staff
- Decision-making across UC
 - **Scholarly Communication Officers Group (SCO)**
 - Validates models
 - **Collection Development Committee (CDC)**
 - Approves campus expenditures
 - **University Librarians (ULs)**
 - Authorize major initiatives





UC Decision Process

- SCO Review: UC Criteria for investment in transformative models (2005)
http://www.uclibraries.com/sco/UC_Libraries_investments_in_Transformative_Models4-14-05.pdf
 - Potential for Transformative Influence
 - Operational Sustainability
 - Disclosure/Transparency
 - Scholar-led
 - Protection from Financial Risk
 - Non-Profit Status

Potential for Transformative Influence



- Insulates scholars (and societies?) from disruption
 - Funding
 - Credentialing
- Funding consortium
 - Can pool funds from multiple sources
 - Market-based tender process
- Focus on peer review services
 - Exerts influence at a higher point in the information food chain
- Supports development of repository services
 - Deposit of final published articles
 - Support for global e-science infrastructure



Operational Sustainability



- Operational support from CERN
 - Expertise in facilitating large-scale global collaboration
- Planned governance structure
- ...tbd....



Disclosure / Transparency

- Report of the SCOAP3 Working Party
<http://scoap3.org/files/Scoap3WPReport.pdf>
- Fundraising progress
<http://www.scoap3.org/fundraising.html>
- Additional background material
<http://www.scoap3.org/publications.html>
- Governance structure must ensure future transparency



Protection from Financial Risk

- No fees unless SCOAP³ is implemented
- Safeguards to build in with publishers
 - Commensurate reductions in license fees
 - Ability to reinstate license fees at the appropriate level without financial penalty if SCOAP³ fails
- Assurances needed from SCOAP³
 - that SCOAP³ fees will be controlled at inflationary levels or less
 - Orderly retreat mechanism
- These principles are built into SCOAP³



Determining UC Contribution Level

- Analyzed systemwide expenditure for SCOAP3 journals
- Holdings-based packages:
 - start with systemwide expenditure for the affected journals at commencement of license, based on distribution of holdings across the campuses
 - multiply by SCOAP³ conversion factor (full vs. partial conversion)
 - expenditure amount rolled forward annually based on negotiated increase caps in our licenses, to determine 2008 levels
 - include systemwide ‘cross-access’ fees on a proportional basis



Determining UC Contribution Level

For each journal:

$$\text{\underline{\$ \$ \$}} \times \text{\underline{100\%}} \times \text{\underline{1.0n\%}} \times \text{\underline{1.0n\%}} \times \text{\underline{1.0n\%}} \dots$$

↑ ↑ ↑ ↑ ↑

Original spend **Conversion factor** **Roll forward based on negotiated annual increases**



Determining UC Contribution Level

- Other packages
 - calculate affected journals as a percentage of the total package, based on list price
 - multiply by SCOAP³ conversion factor



Determining Campus Shares

- Secured CDC approval to transfer systemwide expenditures to SCOAP³, subject to publisher agreement to reduce license fees by corresponding amount
- Campus shares based on existing share of systemwide spend for the journals in question
 - Generally based on prior distribution of holdings across the consortium



Conclusion

- In a time of change, adaptation requires experimentation
- Experimentation entails uncertainty
- Uncertainty should not be a barrier if risks are managed

