

# **Report to Open Access.se from – Best Practices Guide to OA Journal Publishing**

**Submitted by Project Manager Caroline Sutton, Co-Action Publishing**

**December 2008**

---

## **General Comments**

The general work of the project follows the original proposal submitted to OpenAccess.se, though some changes have been made in the work schedule as a result of a change in the vision for the final product. These changes further involve some reallocation of funding within the overall budget.

At the same time this project was awarded funding by OpenAccess.se we became aware of a new Guide to OA Journals Publishing, written by David Solomon. Thereafter, two additional guides emerged. Despite our initial concerns, we are confident that the product we are developing will offer something substantially different from these other works.

We have remained within our overall budget. Travel expenses related to conducting interviews have not been used and will be rolled over into 2009. Hours of labor are slightly above what was budgeted but Co-Action Publishing will absorb this in the event that we are also above budgeted labor during 2009.

## **New Vision for Final Product**

Initially this project aimed to produce an Open Access book that would be published in a PDF format and perhaps HTML. However, the project team came to recognize that such a solution does not meet the needs and habits of today's users. Electronic journals publishing should be cutting edge, and we want our final product to reflect this.

The project is now aimed at producing a web-based environment within which users can quickly identify what they require assistance with and navigate easily to that information. The information itself will be presented with short texts combined with checklists, diagrams, charts, tables, etc. Each section will also contain tools and templates that can be downloaded, links to additional resources on the same topic, and short stories or videos from our interviews with editorial teams that share best practices on that particular topic. This latter element will give users examples of how the information in the guide can be applied in practice.

## **Work Accomplished to Date**

**Kick-off** - The project was kicked-off in February at the same time a working meeting was held to create a detailed work plan and vision for the final product.

**Collection of data and input** – An extensive bibliography that includes both published texts and electronic resources has been accumulated and analyzed.

**Survey of libraries in the Nordic region** – A survey of the Nordic libraries was completed and results have been collated. This survey provides information regarding how libraries discover OA journals and make them visible to their users and will inform sections of the guide.

**Interview guide for editorial teams** – An interview guide design for investigating the best practices among Nordic editorial teams has been prepared and tested and can now be used. According to our initial plan, interviews with such teams should have been conducted during 2008. However, this has been delayed such that we can combine efforts with the NOAP project (more below).

**Pedagogic structure** – The pedagogic structure of how the material in the guide shall be presented has been developed and was honed at the writing camp held in November (see below). This included what type of material, at what level and in what format it shall be presented.

**Technical specifications for final product** – The overall web structure has been defined and a list of specifications for the technical product has been created. This will be used during 2009 to work with a technical partner.

**Writing camp** – A writing camp was held in mid-November at which time we worked intensely over a 2-day period. In addition to working with drafts of various sections, the team worked through a detailed table-of-contents, revisited and honed how the information would be presented and created a more specific design for the web environment.

**Rough drafts of sections** – Rough drafts exist for many sections of the guide. Going forward, tools and templates must be created for most and text added where only figures and tables currently exist.

## **Alterations to Original Plan**

**Expected reallocation of resources** - Because the final product is now envisioned as a web solution, rather than a PDF and HTML document, costs related to both production and labor are greater than budgeted.

It is expected that the NOAP project will allocate funds to the Best Practices Guide, as one project member site has dropped out. These funds will be used to cover a portion of the new technical development costs. In addition, we foresee that some budgeted travel costs will be saved if we can

conduct a number of planned interviews by telephone. These will also be reallocated to the extra costs of working with a programmer.

**Cooperation with NOAP project-** Caroline Sutton and Jörgen Eriksson participated in a NOAP meeting during the spring to present the guide and initiate cooperation in terms of sharing data with us.

The Copenhagen Business School agreed to cooperate on interviewing editorial teams, whereby questions they have concerning further developments to OJS would be combined with our questions directed to best practices. The contact point for this in Cph left on parental leave, and has been unable to continue during 2008. We will be discussing this at a meeting Dec 12, and will go forward with our interviews in January-February alone if Copenhagen is not prepared at this time.

At a Dec 12 meeting with NOAP we expect to be formally accepted as a partner on this project. To date it has been difficult to attain information from this project. We hope by becoming an official member of the group and one source of dissemination that this will facilitate contributions to the guide. With the exception of delaying interviews, this has not been a great problem, as our team has moved forward nonetheless.

**Changes to original work plan** - Due to the format of the final product, the project group has decided not to release a first draft as planned. Instead, we will develop a plan for testing the site and information together with our technical partner.

Our updated timeline:

January-February	Conduct interviews with editorial teams
February	Discuss technical specifications with potential partners and determine price
June	All text and information to be accumulated (with possible exception of input from NOAP)
July-October	Develop technical solution
October-November	Test guide/updates from NOAP group
December/January	Launch guide