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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>1. Content quality: 89 (94%)</td>
<td>1. Content quality and Usage rates: 27 (32%) (tie)</td>
<td>1. The success of the OA initiative: 71 (84%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Cost/Contribution amount: 88 (93%)</td>
<td>2. Lack of funding/Affordability: 58 (68%)</td>
<td>2. Usage rates: 66 (78%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Business model of OA initiative: 69 (73%)</td>
<td>3. Lack of will/interest among faculty: 23 (27%)</td>
<td>3. Increase in participation by peer institutions: 40 (47%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Reputation of publishers: 63 (68%)</td>
<td>4. Discovery issues: 15 (18%)</td>
<td>4. Savings on monograph expenditures: 25 (29%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Discoverability: 59 (63%)</td>
<td>5. User experience issues &amp; Preservation issues: 10 (12%) (tie)</td>
<td>5. Implement scaled pricing to enable smaller schools to participate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Collaboration across institutional boundaries: 43 (47%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Employment of business models that are sustainable, i.e. straightforward and financially fair to libraries and publishers,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Institute campus-wide OA policies</td>
<td></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 publishers**
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**