Learn, Engage, Adapt!

On April 19, 2012, more than 90 professionals gathered at the Embassy Suites Washington, DC–Convention Center for the 2012 Emerging Trends in Scholarly Publishing seminar titled Learn, Engage, Adapt! Knowledge is Power for the Everyday Superhero. The annual seminar was an opportunity for those in the publishing community to get together to share information and experiences and to better understand the issues currently faced within the industry.

This year’s theme provided those within the industry the knowledge to manage these ongoing changes and to consider the possibilities. Nine experts addressed important issues like author misconduct, content acquisition and alternatives to the Big Deal, interdisciplinary and rapid publication journals, and quality metrics.

Author Misconduct
The first session of the day focused on plagiarism, ethics issues, and conflicts of interest in the world of scientific publishing. Debra Parrish, Attorney-at-Law, Parrish Law Offices, started by giving a brief history of research misconduct.

In the 1980s there were a series of high profile cases involving misconduct as well as congressional hearings on research integrity. Scientists and researchers were denying there even was a problem, but the bigger issue was that there was no central policy in place to handle misconduct. This led to the federal government mandating that every institution receiving federal funding must have a policy for responding to allegations, and thus agencies like the Office of Research Integrity (ORI) and the National Science Foundation (NSF) were tasked with investigating allegations.
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How long is your elevator job description? You know, the quick answer you give when new acquaintances ask what you do for a living. Mine takes, well... substantially longer than the typical elevator ride, and it must be said that the average listener tends to check out by the time we get to the second floor. I suspect many of us in the publishing community have similarly extended job descriptions. A publishing professional may also be an ethicist skilled in handling instances of author misconduct, a statistician analyzing the impact of their publications, an expert business manager choosing the right access model for each publication, and a technologist looking out for the latest trends in discovery and distribution of content; the list goes on.

We often use the analogy of “wearing different hats,” but perhaps the mask of the superhero is a more fitting symbol. In the guise of mere mortals it is easy to forget the flurry of super activity that goes into producing each publication. Don the superhero mask, however, and suddenly incredible feats of strength are simply expected.

That’s the idea behind this year’s Emerging Trends in Scholarly Publishing Seminar, Learn, Engage, Adapt! Knowledge is Power for the Everyday Superhero. For those unable to attend our recent event, we’ve devoted this issue of FrontMatter to reviewing the sessions on author misconduct, content acquisition, interdisciplinary and rapid publication journals, and quality metrics and culture.

Maybe the next time you are faced with the inevitable question, “What do you do for a living?” you can save some time and just say, “I’m a bit of a superhero.”

We’re always interested in your feedback about the newsletter and ideas you have for future articles. Please e-mail comments, suggestions, or ideas to frontmatter@allenpress.com.  
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Research misconduct is defined as falsification, fabrication, and plagiarism. The definition is often interpreted differently. An institutional finding of research misconduct doesn’t always result in a federal finding. The interpretations of misconduct also differ between the ORI and the NSF. The two differ in their efforts and the focus of their allegations.

An allegation of misconduct typically triggers an internal investigation at the institutional level, which can include a demotion, termination, or cancelation of a degree. A federal investigation can result in not being able to seek federal funding of any kind for a specified amount of time, recovery of funds, or possible supervision. There can also be criminal convictions as well as civil litigation.

Camille Wicher, Vice President, Corporate Ethics and Research Subject Protection, Roswell Park Center Institution, focused on her personal experience with research misconduct at the institutional level. She explored the topics of cost, prevention, and guidelines.

Science is heavily competitive, and research and publication are major drivers for career advancement. Researchers depend on their reputation for support and funding. Desperation due to the publish-or-perish mentality can motivate the fabrication of research. Some researchers simply believe they can get away with fabrication because an experiment is hard to reproduce. Of course, there are also cases where misconduct is unintentional or unknown to the senior researcher.

Self-policing doesn’t seem to be enough. The idea that false data will be detected during the peer review process doesn’t always work. Closer supervision and more contact among researchers may be one of the best ways to prevent misconduct.

In order to keep scientists from committing misconduct, they must be held accountable. There also needs to be a precedent set that misconduct is unacceptable. Educating about research ethics, conducting audits, and investigating fraud will stop accidental fraudulent research, instill the mindset that data can be checked at any time, and eliminate any temptation. Individual responsibility would entail setting rules for data collection and analysis, reviewing data, and explaining the data analysis process.

Investigating and remediating misconduct is expensive. It affects individuals as well as institutions and funding agencies, and it also taints research. Intangible costs that also should be considered include loss of future earnings, damage to the university, and negative effects on fundraising. Since there aren’t many investigations, there’s not a lot of opportunity to practice and become more efficient. As a result, each investigation requires a lot of time and money. “The 217 cases reported to the ORI last year cost institutions more than $110 million in total”.

Katja Brose, Editor, Neuron, offered an editorial perspective on research misconduct. She focused on what journals are doing to detect and deal with misconduct. Editors and publishers have an ethical obligation both pre- and post-publication. In order to promote quality research, they must weed out any suspicious papers during the review process by responding to and addressing ethical allegations that may arise. It is important to have systems and procedures for investigating situations of misconduct.

Journals must also ensure the validity of published literature. Most journals have author and reviewer guidelines to promote proper ethical behavior. Some journals perform routine screenings of papers while others do random screenings to check for misconduct.

If a journal must address an allegation of misconduct, the common practice is to first contact the authors and reviewers, and then notify the author’s institution, funding agency, and government agencies. Usually, the journal would leave the responsibility of investigation and subsequent censure to the institution or funding agency.

When a journal is presented with evidence of misconduct, they may withdraw a manuscript from review, publish some form of a retraction or correction, ban an author from submission, or write an editorial addressing the issue.
Brose offered these suggestions for preventing research misconduct: active mentoring, clear system for reporting, oversight committee for fair investigation, protective policies for “whistle blowers,” and establishing institution-level standards for record keeping.

**Content Acquisition**

With library budgets remaining strained and journal prices still increasing, content acquisition is changing. The second session of the seminar centered on alternatives to the Big Deal.

**Jonathan Nabe**, Collection Development Librarian for Science & Technology, Southern Illinois University Carbondale (SIUC), shared how his university opted out of their three Big Deals. When SIUC entered into several Deals in 2004, they consumed 24% of the library’s collection budget. The number rose to 33% by 2008 because of two trends. First, the rising subscription costs began to outpace increases to the library’s collection budget. Second, the Big Deal publishers began to outpace increases to the library’s collection budget. Second, the Big Deal publishers began to assimilate other publishers.

With budgets decreasing and prices increasing, SIUC was forced to cancel titles from other, smaller publishers because their Big Deal agreements wouldn’t allow cancellations. SIUC wasn’t the only library caught in this conundrum. In 2005, nearly all members (93%) of the Association of Research Libraries subscribed to at least one Big Deal. SIUC decided to reexamine their Big Deals when they were up for renewal, and they did not renew them in 2009 and 2010. Nabe said they decided they didn’t want to be restricted about what to cut regarding their serials.

Many institutions are part of library consortia. This provides them with stronger negotiating power than if they were alone and gives them the best terms. However, it also creates pressure to continue to participate in order to keep the consortia pricing low, which makes leaving the Big Deals more difficult.

SIUC has turned to interlibrary loan (ILL) to replace lost content. They lost access to about 2,000 non-subscribed titles, but the use of these journals was little to none. They’ve had fewer requests from library patrons than expected; the requests have only accounted for 1.5% of prior demand. However, many libraries are afraid to leave Big Deals because of possible backlash from faculty.

**Michael Levine-Clark**, Collections Librarian, Professor, Penrose Library, University of Denver, explored the subject of purchasing articles on demand and its implications. He started out by discussing patron-driven acquisition (PDA), noting that librarians have always relied on faculty requests and input and usage data to build their collections. He said most are interested in demand-drive acquisition (DDA), in which a library pays only when the content is requested; this is particularly popular for books since they tend to be expensive.

An increase in prices and continuous changes in technology have forced Levine-Clark’s library to look at alternatives to traditional subscriptions and Big Deals. As more subscriptions move online, some libraries are looking at purchasing at the article level. This can be done through ILL or pay-per-view (PPV) purchase of an article. However, DDA may not be ideal for journals because of the low cost per use, high overall use, and a smaller selection of titles.

Libraries looking to replace a Big Deal do have other options. They could replace Big Deals with...
small or medium deals, choose selections title-by-title, or purchase at the article level. One option is the PDF lease, which is ideal for material that doesn’t warrant a subscription. It is expensive and since it is given to the end user it leaves nothing for the library or the next user. Another option is the read-only short-term loan. It is low cost and offers 24-hour access; however, it is not available for download or print and each use equals another payment. The goal of article-level alternatives is to replace Big Deals with similar access and similar cost and to free up more budget dollars and allow more flexibility, which would benefit libraries by increasing access to other journals.

The best options according to Levine-Clark would be a PDF lease that offered full-text access on the publisher’s site or cheaper short-term loans for single users that expire. They would also need a sustainable price, a cost cap, and a guarantee for publishers since libraries wouldn’t be buying up front. Thus, the search continues for a model that works for both libraries and publishers.

Allen McKiel, Dean of the Library, Western Oregon University, examined the idea of access optimization and how it was applied at his university. This method combines different distribution models like Big Deals, individual title subscriptions, PDA, and PPV to maximize volume and minimize the cost per use.

In 2010, Western Oregon University began to cancel individual print and online subscriptions when the usage cost did not justify the cost of a subscription. Instead, they used the funds for PPV. This allowed them to decrease overall costs for journals by 14%, increase title holdings by 105%, increase article usage by 46%, and decrease the cost per article used by 59%.

There was an increase in article usage because there was a larger volume of content, and researchers were able to find more. However, there has also been a shift in how researchers use information. They’re not trying to read an article, but rather do their work by finding the information they actually need and paying for that.

Starting this year, eBooks have become more popular among students. According to the Chronicle of Higher Education, the preference for eBooks among students has finally surpassed the 50% mark.2

McKiel said the cost of eBooks in a subscription model is much less than the cost of purchasing print books. The average cost of a printed book was $80 last year compared to $3 for an eBook. Print still takes up a majority of the collection and garners more usage, but that’s due to the volume of the content available. Although there seems to be a move toward eBooks, until the content volume increases substantially, individual library pricing will not be able to compete with consortia deals.

Interdisciplinary and Rapid Publication Journals

The third session explored the emergence of interdisciplinary and rapid publication journals by looking at specific case studies to better understand the decision making involved in launching such journals and the implications for the future.

John Haynes, Vice President, Publishing, American Institute of Physics, introduced us to these journals by discussing their history and impact, explaining who the forerunners are, and introducing us to AIP Advances.

In 1997, Haynes was involved in the creation of one of the first open access (OA) journals, the Journal of Physics. By 2006, OA was making grounds in biomedical fields with more than 200 journals including the successful PLoS One. PLoS One was built on strong vision and leadership, which included backing by high profile scientists. The highly innovative journal played an important role in reinventing scholarly publishing. After four years, it finally received its first impact factor and by then it had become the largest peer-reviewed journal in the world.

The Optical Society of America (OSA) launched its first open access journal, Optics Express, in 1997; it has become the 12th largest. They now have three OA titles in their portfolio in addition to several subscription-based publications. Their OA journals are not copyedited and are published in half the

*With library budgets remaining strained and journal prices still increasing, the face of content acquisition is changing.*
“The core functions of the journal—registration, certification, dissemination, and archiving—remain the same regardless of size, speed, or access model.”

Kodi Tillery, Marketing

time, making them well received by the scholarly community because of their rapid publication.

Since *PLoS One* has been so successful, it has spawned many open access mega-journals. These journals offer many features, which may include that they are multidisciplinary, peer-reviewed for rigor not impact, use post-publication evaluation, and are supported financially at the article level. Another example of a megajournal is *AIP Advances*, which has published 259 articles in the nine months it has existed. *AIP* experimented with other open access models but decided to work with a gold OA model. They created *AIP Advances* largely because of demand from authors for an OA journal with the AIP brand. It was imperative that the new publication adhered to AIP’s core journal principles of independent scrutiny, wide dissemination, and long-term archiving.

Although these different publication models have definitely impacted the role of the journal in science, the core functions of the journal—registration, certification, dissemination, and archiving—remain the same regardless of size, speed, or access model.

*Costanza Zucca*, Managing Editor, Frontiers, introduced us to the Frontiers Journal Series, which was founded in Switzerland in 2007. The Frontiers Journal Series is unique in that it was founded and is managed by a small team of scientists. Over the last four years, Frontiers has launched 12 journals, including its flagship title, *Frontiers in Neuroscience*. The Frontiers journals have many interesting features including a scientific peer review system that requires a unanimous decision to accept or reject a paper, provides standardized review templates, is interactive by providing feedback in a discussion forum, has an efficient workflow, and remains anonymous during the review process but discloses reviewers once the paper is accepted.

Frontiers also prides itself on offering an equal opportunity for the entire scientific community. It is open to everyone to publish and access research in a fair environment. It is also community based. The journal series is researcher-focused and its purpose is to serve scientists. It covers a range of fields in science and medicine with hopes of expanding to others in the future. Frontiers relies on democratic tiering, which helps the most impactful articles rise to the top. Unlike other journals, each article enters at the same level and can only go up. It also brings advanced IT solutions to the academic industry by tracking online trends. Frontiers has a diverse board with almost 24,000 editors and reviewers from 80+ countries. Its article growth is doubling every nine months and hasn’t dropped in a single quarter in the past two years. Readership has also been successful with 4 million page views and 500,000 visitors from 200 countries each month.

**Quality Metrics and Culture**

The impact factor is crucial in scholarly publishing. Not only does it attract authors to a journal, but it ranks publications based on number of citations. The impact factor isn’t only important to journals, but also to researchers looking for promotion, tenure, or a new position.

In the final session, *Evelyn Jabri*, Product Strategist, Silverchair, addressed the current state of quality metrics and the use of alternative metrics.

Metrics have really evolved over the past five years, and impact means different things to different people. Science Citation Index was one of the first methods that provided a number to evaluate a journal’s impact on the scientific community. The impact factor was created based on the number of citations from a journal. Citations can also be measured at the article level, which allows an individual to measure the impact of their work.

Simply measuring citations has its limitations. They’re not always a direct measurement of a publication’s impact. They fail to measure the impact to society. These include news reports in reputable outlets, scientific briefs in high impact journals, citation in non-scholarly outlets, and usage on the Web. However, the Journal Usage Factor measures the average use of the items in an online journal and is counted monthly from the date of publication.

Research is now instantly accessible, but the impact of social media and the Internet isn’t always being measured. Examples of alternative metrics being used include tools like Faculty of
1000, peerevaluation.com, PLoS Article-level Metrics, and Altmetrics. They provide a quick and accessible view of post-publication comments, article usage, number of views, and article impact by pulling the information from multiple sources. More scientists are also using online tools to manage their reputations. Metrics at the individual level include tools that create online author profiles like ReaderMeter, CitedIn, and ScienceCard. They track number of bookmarks and publications and co-authors. Content is also being measured by Total-Impact, a web-based application that tracks the impact of papers, datasets, and research.

The culture of multiple metrics has advantages and disadvantages. Alternative metrics offer a broad range, provide instant measurement, and show how and from where data is compiled. However, some can easily be skewed, the usefulness of a particular metric may vary from field to field, and the data sources and digital address aren’t always reliable.

After examining all the metrics models, an ideal measure of influence would be based on a panel of metrics to account for the strengths and weaknesses of each metric. It would need to combine input making the tool useful for many due to varying opinions. There also needs to be some form of standardization about what should be counted. And finally, there should always be experimentation, which provides opportunities to improve and grow in the field of metrics.

**Conclusion**

The state of scholarly publishing continues to transform. Many are unsure and hesitant about what the future holds, but hopefully this seminar presented information to encourage publishers on how to handle the changes they continue to face every day. No one can predict exactly what will happen, but hopefully now you have the knowledge to adapt to these changes and to further explore these issues.

To download the presentations or view the videos from the Seminar, visit [http://allenpress.com/resources/archive](http://allenpress.com/resources/archive).
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**Society for Range Management Journal, Rangelands, Wins Excel Gold Award**

Allen Press is pleased to announce that co-publishing client, Society for Range Management, was recently awarded the Gold EXCEL Award for General Journal Excellence for their journal *Rangelands*. EXCEL Awards are given by Association Media & Publishing (AM&P), a professional organization of association publishers.

This year more than 1,000 association publications were submitted and 180 awards were presented for exemplary work in editorial quality, design, advertising and marketing, online publishing, mobile applications, digital editions, and electronic newsletter categories. Three consecutive issues of *Rangelands* were submitted and judged on writing, content, graphic design, and overall packaging. The journal was deemed to have displayed “superior quality in design, writing, and innovation.”

“*Rangelands* is a collaborative endeavor and this award reflects the dedicated efforts of the volunteers, contributors, and our partners at Allen Press to continually improve the quality and content of the journal,” said Lori Hidinger, editor-in-chief of *Rangelands*.

Awards recipients were recognized at the 32nd Annual EXCEL Awards Gala, which celebrated association media, on June 11, 2012, in Baltimore, MD. The Gala was held in conjunction with the annual meeting of AM&P.
Please join us for one or more of our complimentary educational webinars. These one-hour online events will provide practical advice and timely information for managing your publication, association, or society. You’ll learn valuable tips from our experienced, professional staff about reducing time to publish, recruiting members, surveys, online content metrics, and social media. The webinars are free; however, you must register to attend. Register online at allenpress.com.
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