

# Challenges, opportunities, and responsibilities

Elsevier VP Michiel Kolman considers the prospects for scholarly publishers

**T**he biggest threat to scholarly publishing, according to Elsevier VP for Industry Relations Michiel Kolman, 'is the general public's perception that our added value in the research process has diminished since the arrival of the internet.' The industry finds itself facing multiple challenges in this regard. On the one side stand the tech giants that 'stimulate the idea that everything should be accessible without payment'; on the other can be found 'illegal sources like Sci-Hub, which publish copyrighted content under the pretence of Robin Hood-like heroism'. For Kolman, 'only by proving how we add value to research – and communicate with the research community – can we ultimately change people's perceptions.'

Despite these challenges, and the 'dramatic changes' the industry is currently experiencing, Kolman remains optimistic. From his perspective as President of the International Publishers Association, he suggests that the STM sector 'could be considered the most technologically advanced and perhaps innovative of all sectors of publishing'. With both digital and open access both now integral parts of publishers' businesses, he feels that the industry has 'weathered change – technological or otherwise – pretty well in the past, and I'm confident we'll continue to do so for a while.'

Amongst the technological innovations currently being developed, he sees potential in both blockchain and artificial intelligence. Concrete experiments are already underway in applying blockchain technology to the research process, he notes, suggesting two particular areas of interest: 'Peer review could possibly benefit from the stacking and locking of layers of data to make it more secure. There has also been talk of microtransactions through blockchain, which should make acquiring small pieces of content easier.' As for AI, though several publishers, 'including Elsevier', are already using the technology, he notes that it 'is still in its infant phase, and it will take a long time before it will equal – or surpass – human intelligence.' For that reason, Elsevier has been combining AI with human intelligence in ClinicalKey, which helps doctors in emergency rooms quickly diagnose a patient: 'Through AI the system generates better results every time it's used. But the final decision on how to treat a patient is still with the doctor.'

So far as other changes are concerned, Kolman sees open data as another opportunity for publishers 'to serve scientists outside of the publication process', alongside 'the introduction of new

metrics or scholarly collaboration networks'. Innovating creates new challenges, though, as publishers seek to balance their existing and developing businesses: 'how do you keep your existing business healthy, while at the same time working on new products and services? That requires two company cultures. On the one hand, scholarly publishers need to carefully run their business, even more so than before. At the same time, we need to foster a culture of innovation, much like an agile start-up.'

Amidst these changes, publishers also have responsibilities, and Kolman is forthright on these. On the subject of fake news, he has further critical words for the tech giants who are 'increasingly active as publishers but deny they have a role to play in the spread of misinformation and fake news'. More traditional publishers, by contrast, have as their biggest strength 'that they safeguard quality and take responsibility for what they publish.'

On the topics of diversity and inclusivity, Kolman leads from the front: 'As IPA President I try to speak out for diversity and inclusion whenever I can – and I believe we're being heard.' Speaking in Moscow last year, he 'criticised Russia's anti-gay propaganda law'; in Amsterdam, he and his colleagues founded Elsevier Pride Netherlands, a movement that has 'spread to Elsevier offices around the world – including a chapter in Chennai, India.' He notes too the inspiring work done already by the UK Publishers Association, which has set 'concrete goals – particularly in regard to gender and ethnicity – that are meant to ensure the workplace will become a true reflection of the societies we live in'. Much remains to be done, however: Kolman mentions how difficult the diversity and inclusion agenda can be 'in more conservative countries, for example in countries where homosexuality is illegal (and at times punishable by death).' And in the UK, the recent release of data on the gender pay gap 'shows that there's still a lot to be done by publishers, including Elsevier.'

*Michiel Kolman is the keynote speaker at today's Research and Scholarly Publishing Forum.*



Photo: Edwin de Kemp/APE 2018

# Placing authors at the heart of the process

Andy Woodfield (CUP) and Abigail Jones (Sense about Science) explore how the scholarly communications landscape is being transformed by an increasing focus on the changing needs of authors.

**A**bigail Jones and Andy Woodfield both have considerable experience of working with academic authors. Head of Academic Brand Communications at Cambridge University Press, Woodfield has long been responsible for author marketing, while Jones is Researcher and Public Engagement Coordinator for Sense about Science, ‘an organisation that advocates the use of evidence in public life’ and for ‘transparency and honesty about research findings’. Among its many initiatives is a peer review programme, ‘designed to help early career researchers gain more confidence in approaching it and understanding the many types of peer review and the available tools’.

Working so closely with researchers has given Jones insights into their relationship with publishers. She’s seeing positive signs that ‘publishers have become very attuned to the needs of researchers and the changing dynamics of publishing’. Where challenges remain, she says that ‘it’s great to see publishers frequently running panel discussions where researchers can communicate the diverse challenges they face in publishing research’.

This will no doubt come as encouraging news to Woodfield, who has just launched a new, considerably extended version of Cambridge’s Author Hub service. First developed in 2013, Author Hub has since evolved into an online author platform that provides the press’s authors with ‘practical advice to support them on their publishing journey, access sales and royalty information’, and even ‘exclusive author discounts’.

The Agile development process has incorporated author input from the start, Woodfield says: ‘Throughout development, we worked hard to ensure authors were involved to test and provide feedback at various stages – this has been an invaluable process for us to ensure the end result is a platform that is truly valued.’ And as the platform evolves further, authors will continue to be part of the process: ‘We will also be adding lots of extra features to the platform in the very near future ... and we will be working closely with our authors to prioritise and define these requirements.’

This interest in authors’ opinions extends beyond the development of Author Hub. Woodfield explains that Cambridge has ‘for many years now carried out annual author surveys to assess satisfaction, identify authors’ motivations for publishing and get insight into how publishing drives career progression’. One development they’ve noticed over the years has been that ‘communication and personal contact is becoming ever-more important, particularly as there are more demands than ever for academics to demonstrate the impact of their work’.



Researchers are indeed under increasing pressure – both from funders and from the Research Assessment Framework – to demonstrate that their research has impact outside of academia. From her perspective as Public Engagement Coordinator for an organisation so focussed on research in public life, Jones is perfectly placed to appreciate researchers’ needs on this front, and whether publishers are providing support: ‘When researchers are publishing work on complex questions that can easily be misappropriated or misused, it’s vital that they understand why a researcher will need to produce a clear press release. It’s great to see that some publishers have a dedicated press team who work with editors and researchers to develop press releases that lay out findings and guard against misinterpretation. Nevertheless, we think publishers could be even more active in promoting sincere public engagement in research.’

One topic today’s panel discussion will cover is collaboration, and Woodfield is keen to give credit to the organisations Cambridge is working with to extend its author offering, namechecking Sense About Science, Overleaf, Kudos and Altmetrics as partners who help ‘provide authors with extra tools to help demonstrate the impact of their work and support peer review’. Though integrating these third-party services ‘has been challenging at times’, it has also delivered rewards, helping to improve the author experience. The press has also partnered with American Journal Experts on Cambridge Author Services, which Woodfield describes as ‘a new solution offering language editing for prospective authors, especially those who are writing in English as a second language.’ Since its launch last year, the offering has recently expanded to include ‘a new range of manuscript preparation services including formatting, figure preparation, and translation of manuscripts.’

---

*Woodfield and Jones are panellists on the session Author Centricity: How is Author Experience Shaping the Scholarly Communications Landscape? at 10:00 at the Faculty today. They are joined by James McDougall (Trinity College, Oxford), Brigitte Shull (Cambridge University Press), and Damian Pattinson (Research Square).*

# Learning from digital transformation

Kiren Shoman shares some insights from SAGE's innovative video project

**W**ho isn't talking about digital transformation in publishing? A recent report by Imbue Partners reveals that 25% of publishers (mostly STM) consider themselves to be leading the industry, while 50% of educational publishers and 30% in trade feel they are falling behind. But publishers have been building their experience, and the conversations about digital transformation today might arguably be at their most interesting so far.

When I think of digital transformation in academic and education publishing, I'm drawn to the case study I'm most familiar with at SAGE: our entry into video as a new stream of publishing. In 2013 we recognised that the Higher Education space was increasingly using video for teaching and learning, and that we should – and could - rise to the challenge of becoming a video publisher, alongside our traditional book and journal programmes. And what did we learn?

- Don't forget the core publishing value of authors and the relationships we develop. Using these to transition to a new digital-only format was key.
- This could only work if we were able to collaborate effectively across all our departments, to draw on different teams, be they book commissioning, journal and society relationship management, new digital departments commissioning at scale, and on product management and development skills across all these teams.
- We needed to develop new skills, such as digital video

production (and to become astute at recognising where we could do this in-house and where we needed external vendors); new kinds of partnerships, and new business models developed to cater to those new relationships.

- Our marketing and sales teams needed the opportunity (and freedom) to develop new ideas and approaches, and to find new ways of ensuring customer development and support for our new content and format types.
- And with all those and more, the underlying principle was to ensure this transformation was aligned with our mission and strategy – to ensure that our video collections would effectively transport ideas from the minds of scholars to the minds of their students.

We've found that these lessons have translated well in newer forays, including online courses, data products, business cases and more to come... yet with each new departure we know we need to stay open to learning and adapting as we go.



*Kiren Shoman will be a panellist in the session Small Steps, Giant Leaps: The Digital Transformation Experience at the Faculty at 1:00 today. She'll be joined by Kathryn Earle (Bloomsbury), Junaid Mubeen (Whizz Education), John Newton (Alfresco), and Jonathan Brett-Davis (Ixxus).*

## What's new in global copyright?

The Copyright Clearance Center's Roy Kaufman has the answer.

**K**aufman begins his round-up in Canada, where copyright remains 'a concern for the rightsholder community', following legislation in 2012 that 'decimated Canada's publishers and authors by seemingly encouraging uncompensated reuse by the education sector'. Though the Canadian government recently launched a copyright review process that 'could be used to fix the problem ... there does not seem to be much political will to do so.'

News from the United States has been mixed: 'On the good news side, the US Government has elevated the significance of intellectual property theft in trade policy. On the bad news side, US withdrawal from multi-lateral treaties such as the Trans Pacific Partnership has caused those efforts to proceed without the same level of pro-rightsholder focus, with the future of NAFTA in doubt as well.'

2018 may see further transformations in the scope of 'fair use' as a consequence of upcoming court decisions, Kaufman suggests, though he notes that the outcomes are unpredictable: 'In the last two months, we have had two major fair use decisions in the US which challenged the status quo of fair use, with infringement verdicts hitting allegedly "transformational" uses of copyrighted works in new technologies.' Interestingly, one of these decisions concluded that the defendant TVEyes, which

styles itself as a 'search engine for broadcast', had 'exceeded the bounds' of fair use already tested by the Google Books case. 'Have we finally reached the limit?' Kaufman asks.

So far as Brexit is concerned, Kaufman expects that 'Britain's existing copyright laws will remain the same', although he warns that 'the loss of the UK's strong pro-creator voice in Brussels ... is not good.' He is also sceptical about the prospects for copyright legislation becoming more effective against pirates like Sci-Hub: 'Safe harbour rules passed during the early days of the internet are too often used by platforms and ISPs to profit on wholesale infringement. The EU has proposed so called "value gap" legislation, which is a good start, but there are limits as to what you can do with legislation in any single body about illegal activities in other countries. Those acting outside the law tend to do so knowingly in this context.'



*Roy Kaufman will be a panellist in Global Copyright Legislation: What you need to know at the Faculty today at 11:30. He will be joined by Ruth Ellis (RightsZone and Rights2), Sarah Faulder (PLS), and William Bowes (Publishers Association)*

# Who benefits from open access?

Springer Nature VP Carrie Calder considers the benefits – and challenges – of open access.

**F**or Carrie Calder, the benefits of open access are clear: ‘Open approaches benefit the whole scientific and research community, facilitating collaboration, aiding the application of research to solve real-world problems, fostering economic growth, and increasing the public’s appreciation of research.’ For authors in particular, the positives are both marked and measurable: she quotes a recent Springer Nature white paper, *The OA Effect*, which found that OA books were ‘downloaded seven times more ... cited 50% more ... and mentioned online ten times more’.

Springer has long been an OA pioneer, particularly in books: publishing its first OA book in 2011, it now has almost 500 titles. That’s why Calder’s thoughts on the decision that monographs should be open access to qualify for the next Research Excellence Framework, recently restated by HEFCE Head of Research Policy Steven Hill, are particularly worth noting. Publishers are yet to see the details of the requirement, she reminds us, and she ‘welcomes the opportunity to contribute to discussion’ about the forthcoming policy development.

Stressing the ‘richly diverse’ nature of the monograph publishing landscape, Calder reckons that ‘a range of publishing models and solutions may well be required’.

With monographs ‘most valued by disciplines in the humanities and social sciences, areas typically less well-funded than STM subjects’, finding funding for gold open access may be a challenge; green open access, however, ‘delivers poor utility for long-form content’, she suggests.

Nevertheless, Calder thinks that the REF requirement also represents an opportunity both ‘to help to win hearts and minds’ of those yet to be convinced of the value of OA for monographs, and to focus attention on the continued development of sustainable open access options: she notes recent pilots and commitments in ‘the Netherlands, Austria, and Switzerland, where both policy and funding commitments together have made an impact on the growth of OA books.’

---

*Carrie Calder is one of the speakers in the panel session Who Will – or Can – Benefit from the Increase in Freely-Available Research Content? at today’s Research and Scholarly Publishing Forum.*



## Today’s Talks: Wednesday 11 April

**10:00-11:00**

Author Centricity: How is Author Experience Shaping the Scholarly Communications Landscape?

**11:30-12:30**

Global Copyright Legislation: What you need to know

**13:00-14:00**

Small Steps, Giant Leaps: The Digital Transformation Experience

**14:30-15:30**

Inclusivity in Academic Publishing: An Early-Career Perspective

**16:00-17:00**

Educational Publishing in the Baltics

## Tomorrow’s Talks: Thursday 12 April

**11:30-12:30**

Meeting the Changing Needs of Academic Publishing

**13:00-14:00**

Aspirations and Anxieties: How Authors See Copyright Today

**All talks take place at the Faculty, 7A11, in National Hall 7.**

# Copyright and its consequences

Chief Executive of the Society of Authors Nicola Solomon shares some author perspectives on copyright.

**A**s Chief Executive of the Society of Authors, Nicola Solomon is ideally placed to express writers' hopes and fears on copyright. A significant number of her members are academics, and their concerns focus on the implications for their livelihoods of piracy, 'the constant attempts to widen copyright exceptions by those who want free access to information', and some aspects of open access – particularly the 'author pays' model of article processing charges.

As its 2015 consultation on the UK government's new open access requirements demonstrated, academic members of the Society of Authors have, overall, considerable sympathies with the aims of the movement: they 'condemned the very high subscription charges of many journals' and 'appreciate cheap and easy access to research materials'. But the possible impact of expensive APCs on self-funded researchers, those without academic posts, and researchers in under-funded disciplines raised 'considerable concern' among Solomon's members.

Both the European Union's Copyright Directive and the UK's imminent departure from the EU itself are also likely to

have consequences for authors. Solomon is particularly concerned about what will happen to the scope of the exhaustion principle, the established legal doctrine that prevents copyright owners from controlling the circulation of their work after they've received 'reasonable' remuneration for it.

Publishers, however, may be reassured by Solomon's depiction of her members as their allies in the defence of copyright: 'Although authors have their differences with publishers, they are at one with them on the need for a strong copyright regime and the right to keep their work out of the public domain – unless they wish to release it, of course.'

---

*Nicola Solomon will be speaking in the session Aspirations and Anxieties: How Authors See Copyright Today at the Faculty at 1:00 tomorrow. She will be joined by writer, editor, and translator Daniel Hahn, and Christopher Kenneally, Director for Relationship Marketing at the Copyright Clearance Center.*



Photo: Sarah Baxter

# Inclusivity in Academic Publishing

The STM Association's Early Careers Publishers Committee offer an early-career perspective on diversity and inclusivity.

**F**ew would say that publishing is currently diverse,' suggests Sara Bosshart of IWA Publishing, and it 'can only benefit by actively becoming more inclusive'. For Juliet Harrison (Emerald), the main issue is recruitment, and 'our inherent bias and desire to recruit in our own image'. And with privilege playing such an enormous part in creating opportunities, how can publishers 'redress that balance to give people from varying backgrounds a seat at the table'?

Bosshart has several suggestions, from 'targeting different demographics for recruitment, to rethinking job descriptions and degree-requirements'. Unpaid internships are a part of the problem: as Victoria Merriman (Bioscientifica) observes, they 'only serve to open doors to those that can afford to work for free'. Fiona Counsell (Taylor & Francis) suggests that companies are now recognising that they 'act as a barrier to entry and experience, hampering efforts to promote diversity and inclusivity within the industry': aspiring publishers who can't work for free should know that 'academic publishing companies also value experience in the academic library, books retail, social media and marketing, academic research and higher education sector'.

As Bosshart notes, 'many publishers are already starting to put policies and practices in place to promote change', including 'equal opportunity recruitment and hiring practices

as well as fostering an inclusive work environment': Elsevier's Pride Unit and Emerald's Stride initiative are two examples.

The committee is also working on the problem. Merriman mentions the information resources it's developing for graduates, and its mentoring scheme, both of which 'will help to lower barriers to entry into the publishing industry'. Bosshart adds that it's also 'actively working to recruit more diverse and international committee members'.

Counsell sees cause for optimism – 'The face (literally) of the industry is changing even if sometimes it feels like slow progress' – and she urges those who might be put off instead to 'join the industry now and ... be part of that change.' Francesca Lake of the Future Science Group agrees, adding a personal perspective: 'I have a speech impediment, which has caused problems in the past when people don't understand the issue and could have put me off publishing ... where confidence and communication skills are key to a high-flying career. However, I've always been open about it, and I find the people I work with don't see it as a negative, or even an 'issue' at all.'

---

*Inclusivity in Academic Publishing: An Early-Career Perspective takes place at the Faculty at 2:30 today. Members of the STM Association's Early Career Publishing Committee will be joined by experts on diversity and inclusivity including Melanie Dolechek (SSP) and Michiel Kolman (Elsevier) for an open discussion on ways to encourage wider participation and inclusivity in academic publishing.*

# Education in the Baltics: three decades of change

Sintija Buhanovska and Jurgita Nacevičienė consider the state of educational publishing in Latvia and Lithuania.

**M**uch has changed in the education sector since the Baltic states of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania regained their independence in the early 1990s. Listening to representatives from publishers in two of these countries – Jurgita Nacevičienė, Director of Šviesa, Lithuania’s most experienced educational publisher, and Sintija Buhanovska, Head of E-Learning Materials at Zvaigzne ABC Publishers, the leading publishing house in Latvia – what is perhaps most striking is how much the educational sectors in these two countries have in common, nearly thirty years on.

In the Soviet era, as Nacevičienė notes, ‘everything was centralised. One government-owned publishing house published textbooks, prepared by the institutions of the Soviet Ministry of Education. There were no discussions about the content and quality of educational materials.’ Post-independence, competition became the order of the day: in Latvia, several local educational publishers were operating by the end of the twentieth century – including Zvaigzne ABC – while the Lithuanian state publisher Šviesa was sold and became a private company in 2002.

Independence also meant new curricula, and the rapid development of new learning materials to match. Buhanovska remembers this as a challenging time: publishers offered ‘extensive author training’, which often included ‘providing grants for studies in European research centres’; they also had to develop their own highly qualified editorial staff.

Changes – and new challenges – have continued: the absence of a single state publisher has, Nacevičienė suggests, made new demands of teachers, who must now ‘keep track of the latest trends and materials’ to be able to choose ‘the best materials to use in their classrooms’. With the average age of teachers in Lithuania around fifty – the same is true in Latvia, Buhanovska confirms – Nacevičienė says that ‘these teachers started their careers in a different system and are now forced to change their teaching habits completely’.

The introduction of digital technologies into classrooms has created further trials for this generation of teachers. While Nacevičienė notes that ‘access to computers at schools and the trend to use digital gradebooks have encouraged Lithuanian teachers to break the barrier and start using technology in the classroom, step by step’, Buhanovska suggests that in Latvia at least, ‘most teachers still lack the skills necessary to facilitate 21st century learning’. Both recognise the importance of support for teachers: Buhanovska calls for the ‘development of high-quality, up-to-date academic teacher training programmes on university levels’, while Nacevičienė observes that ‘the key success factors encouraging teachers to use digital materials are: training, methods and support combined with content and hardware technologies’.

Teachers unfamiliar with technology have not proved the only challenge to the successful implementation of digital learning, however: as Buhanovska observes, spending has tended to focus on ‘technologies, devices, infrastructure like servers and wi-fi, not content’, and authorities often ‘forget about teacher training



Sintija Buhanovska



Jurgita Nacevičienė

programmes and educational materials’. Nacevičienė adds that, when European funding was used to update schools, ‘content usage was not active enough; the opportunities that technology offered were not fully utilized.’ Both companies, Šviesa and Zvaigzne ABC, have responded to these challenges by creating their own departments devoted to digital: Šviesa offers ‘content and hardware for schools’ in the form of ‘blended learning solutions: where all materials, from paper to computer and smartphone to tablet, are interrelated and integrated’; Zvaigzne ABC ‘has the largest number of digital materials in different formats currently on offer in Latvia.’

Educational publishers in both countries are also wrestling with economic challenges. Buhanovska notes the ‘very severe impact’ on publishers of a fall in the number of school-age children in Latvia, the consequence of both a declining birth-rate and high levels of emigration: lower print-runs are just one of the results. Nacevičienė adds that, in Lithuania, the number of schools and teachers has decreased at a lower rate, resulting in disproportionate costs for maintaining school buildings, which has an inevitable effect on the finances available for educational content: piracy has been one result.

Looking to the future, both publishers see change as a constant. Buhanovska wonders whether the future will bring either the entrance of younger, more digitally positive teachers into the workforce, or if the generation of students who have grown up with smart technologies will ‘become tired of digital devices and require a more face-to-face learning environment’.

Nacevičienė, meanwhile, hopes for ‘an increased focus on developing key competencies and skills over traditional knowledge’ in Lithuania’s forthcoming curriculum review, and a greater emphasis on blended learning; her company Šviesa is already developing new tools that ‘integrate educational content with the individual evaluation tools for students’ in the form of its digital Eduka Classroom and Eduka Gradebook tools, which focus on ‘individual progress and competences’. She worries, though, that ‘schools are used to getting most digital materials for free’ and are ‘not ready to start paying for them’: the challenge will be to ‘change the mindset of the market’.

---

*Sintija Buhanovska and Jurgita Nacevičienė will be speaking on Educational Publishing in the Baltics at the Faculty at 4:00 today. They'll be joined by Marili Pärtel of Estonia's Maurus publishing house, and Helga Holtkamp of the European Educational Publishing Group.*



# Accelerating Global Access to Knowledge

with Digital Transformation Solutions

## FEATURED SESSIONS

**Collaboration & Community:  
The Transition to Open Access**  
Tuesday 10 April  
11:30–12:30  
Stand 7A11, Hall 7

**Small Steps, Giant Leaps:  
The Digital Transformation  
Experience**  
Wednesday 11 April  
13:00–14:00  
Stand 7A11, Hall 7

**Aspirations and  
Anxieties: How Authors  
See Copyright Today**  
Thursday 12 April  
13:00–14:00  
Stand 7A11, Hall 7

Visit us at the London Book Fair  
**Booth #7C16**

[copyright.com/London](http://copyright.com/London) • [#LBF18](https://twitter.com/LBF18)