Name/Email: Abigail Goben,

Affiliation/Organization: I am writing this as a private citizen, though I am employed by the library at a publicly funded university which receives federal grants. Views herein expressed are my own as my employer has submitted their own response already.

City, State: Chicago, IL

Comment 1:

In response to comment one, I would suggest expanding the use of library and information scientists, in collaboration with federally funded scientific research, to facilitate access. Access will grow new markets and opportunities but it will help you have publications archived. Access should be publicly available, not behind any sort of paywall, and the articles need to have appropriate metadata applied to them. As yet, this is not something that computers can do for us. They're working on it, but you still need a person to oversee it. Benefits of this is people who can know the areas wherein they work.

Show citation box

Comment 2:

A standardized way to cite data and the encouragement of the federal government that data set creation and publication is valuable to the academic community must be created. Right now, scientists are so afraid of sharing their publications and their data because they have to hold onto things in order to get tenure and get further grants. There needs to be fiscal rewards for sharing and cross institutional collaboration. And a standardized way of citation would help to protect the IP of the scientists.

Federally funded research should be accessible to those who fund it, namely the public. If an embargo is developed, such as is presently in place with the NIH Open Access mandate, then it should be very short--no more than a year.

There should not be ANY policies that are put into place that place the rights of the public to federally funded research behind the rights of corporate entities (e.g. publishers).
Show citation box

Comment 3

What are the pros and cons of centralized and decentralized approaches to managing public access to peer-reviewed scholarly publications that result from federally funded research in terms of interoperability, search, development of analytic tools, and other scientific and commercial opportunities? Are there reasons why a Federal agency (or agencies) should maintain custody of all published content, and are there ways that the government can ensure long-term stewardship if content is distributed across multiple private sources?

Pro of centralized: people know how to get there, you're not having to search way too many websitesPro of centralized: Cross collaboration across types of science. This is very big in science and medicine right now. If researchers can see one place Pro of decentralized: different places can take up different pieces and specialized. This should be done in conjunction and by funding local universities, specifically uni libraries and librarians, to develop these specialized digital libraries. It shouldn't be long term private sources--there are too many public opportunities to do this right.

Show citation box

Comment 4

NIH Open Access Mandate does nicely, though I don't think the publishers would agree with me. It certainly offers a lot of benefits to students and researchers at smaller institutions who can't pay the gateway access and numerous professionals who aren't on staff at a R1 institution.

Comment 5:

What steps can be taken by Federal agencies, publishers, and/or scholarly and professional societies to encourage interoperable search, discovery, and analysis capacity across disciplines and archives? What are the minimum core metadata for scholarly publications that must be made available to the public to allow such capabilities? How should Federal agencies make certain that such minimum core metadata associated with peer-reviewed publications resulting from federally funded scientific research are publicly available to ensure that these publications can be easily found and linked to Federal science funding?

Provide a centralized location for them to deposit. Make it as easy and seamless as possible-- these are people who already don't have time to do this, don't add mandates that are a) unfunded b) toothless and c) burdensome. Simple is ALWAYS going to be betterTie future grants to complianceHire librarians to write the metadata for you rather than hiring scientists, we tend to be a more cost effective option

Show citation box

Comment 6

Make it simpleMake sure that it is funded as part of EVERY SINGLE GRANT. If a researcher is going to need metadata, then they need to BUDGET FOR IT NOW and the funders need to allow that budgeting or be willing to pay for it themselves. This wouldn't be a burden for libraries if it were funded. If we had the money to hire people to do this, we would jump on the opportunity. certainly I would. We are far too stretched financially though to take this on at present. Also a centralized server would be nice, unrealistic but nice.

Comment 7:

I don't see why not. E-books are where new things are being published. Let's do this right the first time. If there is concern about sniping by other researchers, put an embargo on this--2 years would probably do it.

Show citation box

Show citation box

Comment 8

One of the things I do as part of my job as an academic librarian is teach. Any mandate, ANY mandate, that embargos material more than 5 years will make that information instantly useless to my students. They refuse to go back further than that on a first search, often I have trouble getting them to look past 18 months. I doubt that they are a rarity and as they are our future scientists I imagine this will be pretty standard across the board unless someone is looking specifically for historical record.

Show citation box

Please identify any other items the Task Force might consider for Federal policies related to public access to peer-reviewed scholarly publications resulting from federally supported research.

--
Abigail Goben, MLS
http://HedgehogLibrarian.com