TCR Reports from the Field: R2R / Researcher to Reader’s Fully Interactive Online Conference, February 23-24, 2021

... Reported by Anthony Watkinson, Principal Consultant, CIBER Research and Honorary Lecturer, University College London, <anthony.watkinson@btinternet.com>

Author Note: This selective report especially for the TCR readership is mainly about the presentations, but because it is a rather unusual conference and because in February this year it was rather a pioneer of what a virtual conference can be, I am giving some introductory information. I also have to admit that I am one of the international advisory board mentioned in the next paragraph.

The Researcher to Reader Conference is the successor event to the annual London conferences formerly hosted by the Association of Subscription Agents & Intermediaries (ASA). The Conference aims to continue to be the premier forum for discussion of the international scholarly content supply chain — bringing knowledge from the Researcher to the Reader. It is owned and chaired by the recruiter and consultant Mark Carden, supported by an international advisory board representing stakeholders in the scholarly communication ecosystem.

To explain what “fully interactive” meant it is easiest to quote the joining instructions. They were using three main components which were an online event platform (OnAIR) for timeline management, plenary session presentations, text chat, participant information, one-to-one text or video meetings, and sponsor information. Secondly there was a virtual rooms networking platform (Spatial Chat) for face-to-face video networking and the interactive workshops and thirdly a video-conferencing platform (Zoom) for the Orientations and the Lightning Poster sessions. This sounds complicated and it was sometimes difficult for the older person (as in, your author!) to navigate from one technology to another but feedback was generally positive.

Now to the program which can be found still at https://r2rcconf.com/r2r-conference-programme/. What has been omitted is the Lightning Poster Sessions. These varied in subject, interest and probably in quality but all achieved an audience of 20-30. There are plans to make the videos open during April.

1. The first session was the Panel on Inclusivity: Becoming Part of the Solution – How Publishers Can Help to Improve Inclusivity within Academia. Unusually this panel was exclusively British but some interesting initiatives were revealed. For example the editor of the Journal of Islamic Marketing (a man of colour) explained how difficult it was to get the topic of his journal accepted as serious until his current publisher (Emerald) came along. A publisher (British Medical Journal) highlighted problems of publishers and journal editors making the first move. Articles come at the end of the process but are a research cycle and publishers need to challenge bias. Another publisher (Royal Society of Chemistry) explained the framework for action which now comprises 35 publishers including some of the largest U.S. learned society publishing arms (https://www.rsc.org/new-perspectives/talent/joint-commitment-for-action-inclusion-and-diversity-in-publishing/). This involves commitments, targets and actions. The Company of Biologists who run workshops for their members talked about how to banish mamels (all male panels) from these occasions.
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2. China Research and Publishing – What to Expect in 2021 and Beyond (a heavy topic) was cleverly split up into the separate dialogues between Nicko Goncharoff (a recognised expert formerly of Clarivate) and three separate Chinese speakers zooming in from China. Judy Bai has been engaged for 15 years in STM (now with Digital Science) and explained why the relatively recent China Journal Excellence Action Plan seems to be beginning to work in creating important local journals in English in competition for top papers with existing U.S. journals. The emphasis is on quality. These may be in collaboration with international publishers. The second Chinese speaker was Professor Wu Jinshan, a systems scientist. Wu talked about reforms in higher education which underpins Chinese research. The third China interview was with Dr. Bi Xin who works in a (rare) private university, jointly run with Liverpool University in the UK, a precursor of others. He stated that all journals have to come from a university or similar institution. He also pointed out that there are currently only 400 STM journals in English but this will change. Open Science as well as Open Access are evolving but not yet mandated.

3. The Keynote from Dr. Ivan Oransky focused on Research Integrity. He spoke as a journalist who wrote a blog on retractions (https://retractionwatch.com/) because it was a good story. Retractions were currently gaining especial attention because of Covid but Covid-related papers are not getting more retractions than normal bearing in mind the numbers involved. He felt publishers were too slow acknowledging errors and gave examples. Reasons for retraction are various but there is no point in differentiating sloppiness from deceit: a retraction is always a retraction.

4. The panel on Research Realities in Pictures – Younger Researchers Tell All (about their workflow, process and priorities) was moderated by Heather Staines. The panel included a parasitologist, a chemist, a student of politics and an anesthesiologist. They had varied experiences on lockdown, and views on preprints, social media, open access and funding. It was a model of its type.

5. Two Presentations were given on Open Access Books: Diversifying Readership Through Open Access by Mithu Lucraft of Springer Nature and a New Funding Model for Open-Access Monographs from Professor Martin Eve and Dr. Frances Pinter. The first presentation represented the latest stage in the engagement by Springer with open access books; this is explained and put in context by another contribution from her at https://blogs.lse.ac.uk/impactofsocialsciences/2021/03/03/open-access-to-academic-books-creates-larger-more-diverse-and-more-equitable-readerships/. It was not surprising to learn that OA leads not only to more usage but another aspect was the new usage in different, less wealthy countries. The new funding model involved collaboration between COPIM and the Central European University Press. For further information see https://ceup.openingthefuture.net/news/. The current problem is funding particularly the backlist.

6. The Debate was moderated by Rick Anderson, University Librarian at Brigham Young University, on Paid Peer Review – Resolved: Journal Publishers Should Pay Academics for Providing Peer Review. The proposer was Professor Brad Fenwick, senior vice president at Taylor & Francis seconded by Dr. James Heathers, Chief Scientific Officer at Cipher Skin. Against was Alison Mudditt, CEO of PLOS, seconded by Dr. Tim Vines, founder of DataSeer. A vote was taken at the start of the proceedings and again at the end. The debate was won on the basis of the swing from one vote to the next: the motion was lost. The format was not unlike that known in the U.S. from the Charleston conferences. Jeffrey Brainard reported on the debate in Science in March.

7. The Keynote on cOAlition S Rights Retention Strategy was presented by the executive director Professor Johan Rooryck. Readers will know that Plan S was a European initiative but funders signed up including the Howard Hughes Medical Institute and the Gates Foundation based in the U.S. Coalition S moves forward the Plan and there have been clarifications and adjustments following interaction with publishers and researcher organisations. The substance of Rooryck’s presentation can be found at https://www.coalition-s.org/resources/. He was concerned mainly with making sure that where research is funded under S terms, as a minimum the Authors Accepted Manuscript (AAM) will be deposited in an open access repository, and that this should carry at last a CCBYND license favoured by humanities scholars.

8. A Panel on COVID-19 Rapid Review and Preprints was moderated by Dr. Sarah Greaves, formerly Chief Publishing Officer of Hindawi. Speakers were Phil Hurst, publisher at The Royal Society; Dr. Daniela Saderi, Director of PREview; and Professor Ludo Waltmann of the Research on Research Institute. This group described a unique collaboration mainly of smaller OA publishers described at https://royalsociety.org/news/2020/04/covid-research-rapid-review. The emphasis was on speeding up peer review, being able to transfer papers, and improving diversity in who does peer review. For the future there is a need for new standards.
Libraries on the Move: Three New Agreements Announced

1) DOAJ and ASERL: The Directory of Open Access Journals (DOAJ) has announced a new partnership with the Association of Southeastern Research Libraries (ASERL). DOAJ indexes over 15,000 peer-reviewed open access journals from around the world. Founded in 1956, ASERL is one of the largest regional research library consortia in the U.S., serving 37 institutional members in 11 states. Under the new partnership ASERL will be able to offer support for DOAJ to consortia members at a substantial discount. “ASERL libraries have long supported improvements in scholarly communication and the infrastructure that undergirds the research, teaching and learning missions of our member institutions. Facilitating investments in community-based organizations like DOAJ clearly advances those goals,” commented Jan Lewis, Director of Academic Library Services at East Carolina University and President of ASERL’s Board of Directors for 2020-2021. See www.aserl.org for more information.

2) T&F and Jisc: Taylor & Francis Group and Jisc have signed a three-year transitional agreement combining access and open access (OA) publishing to Taylor & Francis Group’s portfolio of journals. According to the press announcement, the agreement provides participating Jisc members with an OA allowance that covers 100% of the current levels of UK research Taylor & Francis Group has been publishing on a subscription basis. Of note, T&F is the largest humanities and social sciences (HSS) publisher, publishing 9% of all UK research, so this agreement is particularly important as a route to OA for HSS researchers who do not regularly benefit from the same levels of funding as their peers in the science, technology and medicine (STM) disciplines. To ensure that the deal continues to reflect researchers’ needs over time, participating members are being invited to sign up for an initial three-year period and have the option to extend for a further two years. The deal includes:

• OA publishing for UK authors, up to an agreed cap, in Taylor & Francis Open Select journals, on a first come, first served basis, at no cost to the author;
• Reading access to subscription content based on current holdings;
• Provision of fully integrated library and author OA infrastructure to ensure smooth implementation and workflow, including the Taylor & Francis Research Dashboard which allows participating members to monitor their institution’s OA output simply and effectively.

For more information, contact communications@tandf.co.uk.

3) UC and Elsevier: The University of California announced on March 16, 2021, a pioneering open access agreement with the world’s largest scientific publisher, Elsevier, making significantly more of the University’s research available to people worldwide — immediately and at no cost. The deal will put more UC research into the hands of individuals across the globe at a time when international collaboration to fight COVID-19 has illuminated the value of open access to scientific findings. The agreement is the largest of its kind in North America to date, bringing together UC, which generates nearly 10% of all U.S. research output, and Elsevier, which disseminates about 17% of journal articles produced by UC faculty. The deal will double the number of articles made available through UC’s transformative open access agreements. Under the four-year deal, all research with a UC lead author published in Elsevier’s extensive portfolio of hybrid and open access journals will be open access by default. It is the first such agreement to include open access publishing in the entire Cell Press and Lancet families of journals, which are considered among the world’s most prestigious scientific and medical titles. University researchers will also be able to read articles published in Elsevier journals.

More details are available at https://osc.universityofcalifornia.edu/uc-publisher-relationships/uc-and-elsevier/.

SSP Upcoming Webinars

April 21, 2021 — “Global Trends in Open Access” — 11:00 am ET

Speakers from Africa, Asia, and Latin America sharing their experiences of and perspectives on Open Access. Presenters will provide an overview of Open Access in their respective countries and regions and then take questions from the audience.

June 22, 2021 — “The Article of the Future Revisited” — 11:00 am ET

Given the overwhelming number of micro-demands for our attention, is the long-form article still a relevant means to serialize content? This webinar will explore how the article of the future might better meet end-user needs. A new model could take the form of delivering summarized content at a free or low rate, with full content and data available at a higher rate. It could also differentiate between the strict clinician or practitioner requiring relevant practice updates, and the researcher looking for more in-depth data. This panel will consider the opportunities presented by new article business models and their potential impact on scholarly communications.

For more details and to register, logon to https://www.sspnet.org/events/upcoming-ssp-events/.
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9. The Workshops are an intrinsic part of the conference. All attendees are enrolled in a workshop after being asked for their preferences (but of course cannot be forced to actually attend). They happen at intervals during the meeting and they report back just before the conclusion. The topics this year were New Models for Open Access, Who Decides What Is Good Academic Writing?, An Antiracist Framework for Scholarly Communication, Usage Metrics for Open Outputs, and the Many Shapes of Peer Review.
Don’t Miss This!

The Charleston Advisor’s April 2021 issue (v.22, no.4) will be heading your way soon; our online versions are available at IngentaConnect or via our homepage at www.charlestonco.com. Included in the latest issue are the following reviews:

- African American Communities (Adam Matthew)
- COVID-19 (Coronavirus): ADB Information Centre (BMJ/Asian Development Bank)
- Drama Online Revisited (Bloomsbury Publishing)
- Early Modern England (Adam Matthew Digital)
- Gale Case Studies (Gale/Cengage)
- Gale Presents: Peterson’s Test and Career Prep (Gale/Cengage)
- Global Literature on Coronavirus Disease (COVID 19) (World Health Organization)
- Google Books (Google)
- Himetop: The History of Medicine Topographical Database (Campus Bio-Medico University of Rome)
- Issues & Controversies in History (Infobase)
- Newsbank: Access to World News Research Collection (Newsbank)
- Policy Commons (Coherent Digital)

Don’t forget! Reviews from this issue as well as over 500 updated reviews from past issues are available and fully searchable in the ccAdvisor database, a joint project of Choice and The Charleston Advisor now offered through EBSCO. Learn more at https://www.ebsco.com/products/research-databases/ccadvisor.

Accessible Archives’ Comprehensive American History Databases Are A One-Stop Source for Essential Newspapers, Periodicals, and E-Books!

- African American Newspapers
- America and World War I
- American County Histories
- Anatomy of Protest in America
- The Civil War Collection
- Frank Leslie’s Weekly
- Godey’s Lady’s Book
- The Liberator
- National Anti–Slavery Standard
- Pennsylvania Gazette
- Quarantine and Disease Control in America
- South Carolina Newspapers
- Virginia Gazette
- The Woman’s Tribune
- Women’s Suffrage Collection

LET’S SET-UP A FREE TRIAL & SEND YOU A PRICE QUOTE TODAY!

Contact our exclusive sales & marketing agent: iris.hanney@unlimitedpriorities.com or call 239-549-2384