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Who Owns Your Work: Copyright in the Digital Age

Comment on this issue

It's been ten years since CSU Libraries launched its Web site, and since then the Internet has revolutionized the way we bring you information. Today the Library provides you with access to more than 24,000 electronic journals and more than 198 databases, regardless of whether you're at home, at the office, or out in the field. The Library Web site has no doubt transformed the way that CSU faculty and staff conduct their writing and research. The Internet has had a similar effect on the classroom, with students now able to do research from computer labs inside the Library, across campus, in their dorm rooms, and beyond. Thanks to the Library's Electronic Reserve system, we're also making it easier for you to share materials online with your students without the costly expense of paper copies.

As a society, we are in the midst of an information revolution. For the first time in history, Internet technology enables the dissemination of knowledge and the exchange of ideas both globally and instantly. The Internet is also transforming notions of authorship. As blogging, e-mail listservs, and other forms of online publishing are embraced across academia, the ways in which we publish and share our work are being radically transformed. In the midst of this burgeoning technology, lawmakers are faced with important questions on the ways in which to govern—or, some would argue, to protect—information in the digital environment. This issue of Library Connection explores copyright in the digital age. Who owns creative work and who has the right to share it? For educators, the Know Your Copy Rights will serve as a quick guide to help you navigate some important questions when sharing digital content in the classroom. We're happy to assist you in the Library and the General Counsel's Office can also answer specific legal questions pertaining to copyright information. The article we present here in Library Connection is addressed to you as authors. It is meant to help you explore the options of ownership of your own creative work—the rights you have, the rights you sign away, and the rights you may want to keep.
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Exploring Copyright

In an academic setting, publishing is essential. It enables us to communicate our research and teaching to others, to further the exploration of ideas and theories, to share discoveries and make important advances that directly impact our communities and quality of life. Ideally, publishing gives us a voice in the vast discourse of our fields. Most practically, it provides us with professional standing and enables us to pursue important advancements such as tenure. Most view publishing as the end result of months or sometimes years of toil—the products of our research and teaching. Once our work has been accepted, especially if it is to be published by a top-tier journal, we often sign whatever paper the publisher puts in front of us. It is so important that our work has made the journey from our own desktop and into the wider world to be read, discussed, and hopefully cited that most of
Can Google inherit quality? August 14, 2007

That is the question posed by Paul Dupigny, a professor at UC Berkeley, the University of London and Santa Clara University, about the Google Books Project. His article, “Inheritance and Loss: A Brief Survey of Google Books,” was just published in First Monday, a peer-reviewed online journal about the internet.

Dupigny’s point is that the Google Books project will really outstrip most other projects to digitize cultural artifacts, making them “appeal inept or inadequate.” But the authority and quality of the Google project, Dupigny argues, is based on a kind of inheritance from the reputation of the libraries involved. So Dupigny sets out to see if Google really is the qualitative heir of Harvard and Stanford.

His results are disheartening. His search for a deliberately unconventional book, Sterne’s “Tristram Shandy,” returns results likely to confuse and discourage a casual reader. The first result on Google’s results list, a copy from Harvard, is so badly scanned that it is virtually illegible, with words cut off by the gutter on nearly every line. Elsewhere the text fades to indistinguishable scratchings. And some of Sterne’s eccentricities are missing; the black page of mourning for the dead Pardon Youck simply is not included in the Google scan. When Dupigny tries the second result from his search, things get worse. The first page of the scan is blank and the second page puts the reader at the end of chapter one and the beginning of chapter two — of the second volume. Nothing informs the reader (other than comparison with a printed text) that they have been plunged into the middle of the book.

Dupigny’s judgments on Google Books are harsh: the project ignores essential metadata like volume numbers, the quality of the scans are often inadequate, and sometimes editions that are best consigned to oblivion are given unseemly prominence for no discernible reason that is his conclusion regarding the second text he found, from Stanford. Rather than inheriting quality from Harvard and Stanford, he concludes, “Google threatens not only its own reputation for quality and technological sophistication, but also those of the institutions that have allied themselves to the project.”

It is true that the real value of the Google Books Project is not so much to find reading matter for people as to direct them to which books are most likely to be of help or interest to them. Few people, one presumes, will try to read “Tristram Shandy” in the Google books format. But the failures of visual quality and metadata control threaten even the more modest view of Google Books as a giant index. Without a higher degree of quality than Dupigny discovered, it is hard to argue that Google is superior in any way to a comprehensive online catalog from a major library.

Yale says no to an OA flavor August 10, 2007

The announcement this week that Yale University will no longer maintain its membership in BioMed Central is another example of the growing pains involved as scholar publishing adapts itself to new business models and forms of distribution.

BioMed Central is an open access publisher that relies on author fees and institutional memberships to pay the cost of online publishing. The resulting 180 peer-reviewed electronic journals are freely available to all users. But open access is not free, and Yale decided to withdraw its institutional membership, which covered the fees for all articles published in BioMed Central journals by Yale authors, because the price was getting too high. In one sense, this is good news for open access publishing: it means that lots of authors from this prestigious university are publishing in open access journals. Clearly quality, peer-reviewed scholarship is compatible with open access. In its response to...
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Yale Drops Its Pre-Pay Membership to BioMed Central

As widely reported in the media, Yale University has dropped its institutional membership in BioMed Central.

This isn’t a reflection on lack of support in Yale’s part for the idea of open access, in fact, membership was dropped because Yale authors are apparently flocking to publish their articles in the openly accessible BMC journals, which means the cost to the library, which was picking up the publication fees for the papers, was cut out of budget. There were 41 BMC papers published by Yale authors in 2006; already in 2007, there have been 41. (Not every Yale author in all these cases.) By taking an institutional “pre-pay” membership in BMC, the Yale Library had opted to try to pay the BMC author publication fees via the Institutional Membership program, and those fees just got to be too much for them to bear any more. More Yale authors opted for publishing in BMC journals.

To be sure, the article charges for publishing in BMC journals have been rising, too. Yale authors can, of course, continue to publish in BMC journals, and it will be interesting to see how many still opt for this. They will have to pay the page charges out of their grant money, as over half of the BMC authors have been doing.

As David Storr, Yale’s Associate Dean, pointed out that the article processing charges that BMC publishers charge, $1,750-$2,000, are quite steep. It is possible to suggest that libraries consider the future when instead of purchasing subscriptions to journals it may be a role of the library to support open access publishing for the greater good, from this perspective.

That is why BioMed Central introduced its institutional membership scheme, which allows institutions to centrally support the dissemination of open access research in the same way that they centrally support subscription journals, thereby creating a “level playing field.”

In order to ensure that funding of open access publication is sustainable, we have encouraged institutions to set aside a small fraction of the indirect funding contribution that they receive from funders to create a central open access fund.

It should be noted that BMC’s Institutional Membership program, whereby universities (usually the library) pre-pay 15% or most of the author’s article fees is not the only way in which the institution can show its support for the BMC model of open access, BMC also offers a "permissions Waiver" which is not tied to the number of articles submitted from an institution; it offers a modest (usually 15%) reduction in the article publication charge.

At this point, the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign is neither an Institutional nor Supporting member of BMC.

He goes on to conclude...

"We believe in the widest possible access to scholarly research supported by worldwide business models and think BioMed Central develop a viable economic model which allows them to make reasonably low cost across all interested disciplines, we would consider reviewing our financial support."

BMC Publishing, Matthew Goodman, Executive Editor, is in the process of making it clear that the article processing charge that BMC publishers charge, $1,750-$2,000, are quite steep. It is possible to suggest that libraries consider the future when instead of purchasing subscriptions to journals it may be a role of the library to support open access publishing for the greater good, from this perspective.

That is why BioMed Central introduced its institutional membership scheme, which allows institutions to centrally support the dissemination of open access research in the same way that they centrally support subscription journals, thereby creating a "level playing field."

In order to ensure that funding of open access publication is sustainable, we have encouraged institutions to set aside a small fraction of the indirect funding contribution that they receive from funders to create a central open access fund.

It should be noted that BMC’s Institutional Membership program, whereby universities (usually the library) pre-pay 15% or most of the author’s article fees is not the only way in which the institution can show its support for the BMC model of open access, BMC also offers a "permissions Waiver" which is not tied to the number of articles submitted from an institution; it offers a modest (usually 15%) reduction in the article publication charge.

At this point, the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign is neither an Institutional nor Supporting member of BMC.