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### ASSESSING THE FUTURE OF OA MONOGRAPHS IN THE HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

#### SURVEYS OF ACADEMIC LIBRARIANS CONCERNING OPEN ACCESS MONOGRAPHS

**2013 KU Pre-Pilot Survey of Libraries**
- **Responses:** 62 from U.S. & U.K.
- **Focus:** ideal platforms (HathiTrust, JSTOR, Project MUSE), selection (subject packages or individual titles), pricing, number of titles
- **51%** of US respondents were concerned or somewhat concerned about free riders.

**2014 OAPEN-UK Librarian Survey**
- **Responses:** 109 from U.K.
- **Focus:** acquisition, discovery, business models
- **43%** participate in OA monograph initiatives using library-funded, consortium-based business models.

**2015 PCG OA Monographs Survey**
- **Responses:** 152 from 34 countries; **78%** librarians, 17% publishers, and 5% library staff member
- **Focus:** acquisition, discovery, funding, role of libraries
- **68%** of libraries decide to list OA books in their catalog based on relevance to the curriculum while **67%** do so by faculty request.

#### 2016-17 OA MONOGRAPH SCALABILITY SURVEY OF COLLECTIONS UNITS AT ACADEMIC LIBRARIES IN THE U.S.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q4.3 - When your library is evaluating an OA initiative, what are the major...factors you consider in determining whether or not to participate?</th>
<th>Q4.5 - Looking forward, what are the biggest obstacles to or areas of concern for an expansion in your library’s participation in OA book initiatives in the Humanities and Social Sciences? (select up to 3)</th>
<th>Q4.6 - How will you judge the success of your participation? (select all that apply)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>103 valid responses</strong></td>
<td><strong>1 authoritative response per library</strong></td>
<td><strong>37 states and D.C.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Content quality:</strong> 89 (94%)</td>
<td><strong>1. Lack of funding/Affordability:</strong> 58 (68%)</td>
<td><strong>1. The success of the OA initiative:</strong> 71 (84%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Cost/Contribution amount:</strong> 88 (93%)</td>
<td><strong>2. Content quality &amp; Usage rates:</strong> 27 (32%) (tie)</td>
<td><strong>2. Usage rates:</strong> 66 (78%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Business model of OA initiative:</strong> 69 (73%)</td>
<td><strong>3. Lack of will/interest among faculty:</strong> 23 (27%)</td>
<td><strong>3. Increase in participation by peer institutions:</strong> 40 (47%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. Reputation of publishers:</strong> 63 (68%)</td>
<td><strong>4. Discovery issues:</strong> 15 (18%)</td>
<td><strong>4. Savings on monograph expenditures:</strong> 25 (29%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5. Discoverability:</strong> 59 (63%)</td>
<td><strong>5. User experience issues &amp; Preservation issues:</strong> 10 (12%) (tie)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 7 RECOMMENDATIONS FOR A SCALABLE & SUSTAINABLE FUTURE FOR OA MONOGRAPHS

1. **Limit to highest quality content from trusted scholarly publishers**
2. **Implement scaled pricing to enable smaller schools to participate**
3. **Employ business models that are sustainable, i.e. straightforward and financially fair to libraries and pubs, and other stakeholders**
4. **Gather reliable local usage data**
5. **Improve discoverability by standardizing workflows and best practices**
6. **Advocate for OA monographs among faculty and school administrators**
7. **Institute campus-wide OA policies**

---

*We want to support models that seem sustainable and economical. OA initiatives that appear to perpetuate the status quo publishing model on the backs of libraries is not one we are likely to support.*

*Freeriders are institutions who don’t contribute to OA initiatives, for whatever reason (budgetary, philosophical, etc.). I’m not sure that I’m not worried about that, but I can only control their actions, I can only control my own. It doesn’t make sense to me to use lack of support by others as a factor as to whether or not I contribute.*

*“Notifications to us from the OA initiative about the availability of MARC records is ideal (don’t make us chase after the records, or have to enter reminders to check for records into our calendars, please): the earlier the better, esp for front list titles, to avoid ordering duplicates.”*

*The best business model is that which provides the best literature to the rest of the world – individuals as well as institutions in the U.S. and globally that “don’t have many resources - it’s all good!”*

*“We're needing to support more and more of our collection budget expenditures with 'metrics’... and I’d hate to see OA initiatives collapse (with institutions not being able to continue support) because they missed that metrics train.”*
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