

September 2000

From the Other Side of the Street-Principles to live by? Hardly

Thomas Bacher

Purdue University Press, bacher@uakron.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://docs.lib.purdue.edu/atg>



Part of the [Library and Information Science Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Bacher, Thomas (2000) "From the Other Side of the Street-Principles to live by? Hardly," *Against the Grain*: Vol. 12: Iss. 5, Article 25.
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.7771/2380-176X.3580>

This document has been made available through Purdue e-Pubs, a service of the Purdue University Libraries. Please contact epubs@purdue.edu for additional information.



From the Other Side of the Street — Principles to Live By? Hardly.

by **Thomas Bacher** (Director, Purdue Press, 1207 SCC-E, W. Lafayette, IN 47907-1207; ph. (765)494-2038; fax (765)496-2442) <bacher@purdue.edu>
www.thepress.purdue.edu

The outcome of a recent conference (The Tempe Principles) for academic stakeholders was a set of guidelines intended to transform the scholarly publishing system. Unfortunately, when the full gamut of players is not included (no commercial publishers, e-content providers, net universities, subscription agencies, end-users, etc.), the efficacy of the suggestions and the foundation for the changes in scholarly interchange must be questioned.

Trends over the last few years have shown that the super-inflationary spiral of serial information costs is slowing down. The growth of digitally based information has increased spurring new players to find publishing alternatives in narrow fields. Still, information does come at a cost, a cost that must be borne by all players (Tempe Principle 1 - The cost to the academy of published research should be contained so that access to relevant research publications for faculty and students can be maintained and even expanded. Members of the university community should collaborate to develop strategies that further this end. Faculty participation is essential to the success of this process.). However, limiting an author's financial incentive by asking her or him to retain certain rights and to negotiate reasonable list prices (Guideline 6 — In negotiating publishing agreements, faculty should assign the rights to their work in a manner that promotes the ready use of their work and choose journals that support the goal of making scholarly publications available at reasonable cost.) polishes the car but leaves the rusty body. Markets set prices not publishers. Also, trying to reduce the proliferation of information by imposing qualitative standards (Guideline 8 — To assure quality and reduce proliferation of publications, the evaluation of faculty should place a greater emphasis on quality of publications and a reduced emphasis on quantity.) presupposes that the publishing chicken came before the writing/information egg. The fine line of determining quality also leaves ajar the subjective door allowing politics and personalities to walk right in.

Failing to embrace all players is reflected in some of the group's proposals. By including organizations like netlibrary.com, questia.com, or recipicol.com, the group's *weltanschauung* would have been expanded. Issues of

interoperability, standards, and searchability are all being addressed quite successfully (Guideline 2 — Electronic capabilities should be used, among other things, to: provide wide access to scholarship, encourage interdisciplinary research, and enhance interoperability and searchability. Development of common standards will be particularly important in the electronic environment.). The other face of dissemination is the knotty problem of archiving (Guideline 3 — Scholarly publications must be archived in a secure manner so as to remain permanently available and, in the case of electronic works, a permanent identifier for citation and linking should be provided.). Academe seems to be enslaved by the adage if we do not know history, we are bound to repeat it. Information is absolutely important. Storing the information is technologically feasible. Yet, is our linear thinking model being changed? Would we be inventing and advancing at a greater rate if we were not always burdened with the past?

Although determining quality standards on individual works is less desirable, larger quality issues are inherently addressed in today's academic community. Branding, confirming the quality of information releases (Guideline 4 — The system of scholarly publication must continue to include processes for evaluating the quality of scholarly work and every publication should provide the reader with information about evaluation the work has undergone.), will become more critical as we see the rise in information sources. We must become our own best promoters and let users know the stamp of approval from our home institutions carries unsurpassed value. Timeliness of publication (Guideline 7 — The time from submission to publication should be reduced in a manner consistent with the requirements for quality control.) is another determinant of quality. Some strains of information lose value as they decay. Destination Websites, storehouses for varieties of information, and e-publications are providing the needed interplay to expose works to a broad critical audience in a timely fashion. Vetting of information quality will become more interactive which in some fields might break the parochial nature of current systems of scholarly review. "If you approve my work, I'll be more approving of yours" could become less of a worry

when a larger academic community comments on any given piece of scholarship.

Warnings by participants regarding fair use (Guideline 5 — The academic community embraces the concepts of copyright and fair use and seeks a balance in the interest of owners and users in the digital environment. Universities, colleges, and especially their faculties should manage copyright and its limitations and exceptions in a manner that assures the faculty access to and use of their own published works in their research and teaching.) and privacy (Guideline 9 — In electronic as well as print environments,

***"Be at your life-long-learning best.
Read from a University Press."***

***— Frankfurt Book Fair:
Hall 8.0 M912***

scholars and students should be assured privacy with regard to their use of materials.) should be examined carefully. New licensing arrangements are creating myopias in the use of information. Unabated, this trend will continue to grow and will limit fair use in the Academy. Guarding privacy, while of importance, must be tempered with other issues that could lead to a better understanding of how we use and update information.

Finally, some of the signatories of the agreement should take a look at their own practices before they stand on the scholarly pulpit. Presidents of universities must be cognizant of the fact that a failure to support university presses over the past decade have increased university libraries' reliance on commercial information providers. Scholarly organizations, like the American Chemical Society and the American Mathematical Society, must ask themselves why their subscription strategies are mired in supporting their printed products instead of re-tooling to digital output. Initiatives similar to SPARC must be careful in their actions to make sure that they are reducing per page cost for journals that they are supporting, don't only rely on library subsidies to exist, and do what they can to support faculty in retaining certain use privileges of their works.

Technology continues to eradicate boundaries. Likewise, the Academy must do so to participate in the new scholarly information age. 🍷