NASIG Board Meeting Minutes
February 9, 2021

Executive Board:
Betsy Appleton, *President*
Ted Westervelt, *Vice President/President-Elect*
Kristen Wilson, *Past President*
Beth Ashmore, *Secretary*
Cris Ferguson, *Treasurer*

Members at Large:
Keondra Bailey
Katy DiVittorio
Michael Fernandez
Mary Ann Jones
Shannon Keller
Courtney McAllister

Chris Bulock, *Ex Officio*

Guests:
Open Initiatives Committee: Andrew Wright, David Scherer, John Morgenstern, Melissa Hart
Cantrell, Rivkah Cooke, Virginia Martin; Proceedings Editor, Paul Moeller

Regrets:, Anu Moorthy, *Ex Officio,* Angela Dresselhau, *Ex Officio*

1.0   Welcome
The meeting was called to order at 1:00 pm Eastern.

2.0   Presentation by and discussion with Open Initiatives Committee

Members of the open initiatives committee presented slides laying out the options the committee
has explored to publish the NASIG proceedings open access (OA) in accordance with their
revised charge: Report on the benefits and drawbacks of available options for transferring the
NASIG Proceedings to an open platform, and recommend the best option for NASIG to take its
Proceedings Open Access. The committee began working under the new charge in September
2020 and Paul Moeller, proceedings editor, began working with the group in November 2020. In
December 2020, the committee did an environmental scan of open access publishing platforms
and used a rubric to narrow the field down to six platforms. The criteria for evaluation used in
the rubric were:

● Creates revenue for NASIG (Not Required)

- Associated costs/fees (Not Preferred)
- Editorial services - Peer Review (NR), copyediting, typesetting (Preferred)
- Copyright and permissions requests (NR)
- Indexing and metadata creation (Required)
- Marketing/other visibility (Preferred)
- Standard OA author agreement (NR)
- Fit with publisher's portfolio (Preferred)
- Complies with accessibility standards - WCAG 2.0 (Required)
- Timely production - no more than 3 months (NR)
- Option for print copies (Preferred)
- Aggregator potential (NR)
- Freely available online (Required)
- Archiving/Preservation services (Preferred/Required)

The platforms that the committee presented included:

- Open Journal Systems (OJS) - CU Boulder would cover annual $1,200 hosting fees. OJS is a popular and well-known option for library publishing, and CU Boulder already hosts another library journal, The Journal of New Librarianship. OJS has a comprehensive journal management and review system and many options for customizing the interface, but many features will be manual (e.g. preservation and metadata export enabled by plugins, and there is a guide for optimizing accessibility). Explore more here: https://journals.colorado.edu/
- Scholastica - Journal hosting services cost $1,188 annually. Services such as typesetting and preservation in Portico are available for additional fees. Scholastica is another popular and well-known option for open access journal hosting and other services. It is widely used by law reviews and other legal journals. Explore more here: https://scholasticahq.com/
- Ubiquity Press - Journal hosting services cost $1,300 annually, with a $2,200 initial set-up fee. Services such as typesetting, copyediting, and preservation (CLOCKSS/ LOCKSS) are available for additional fees. Copyediting is available for a cost of $662 annually and $158 per article. Typsetting in JATS is available for $788 annually and $158 per article. Ubiquity indexes in DOAJ for free and in EBSCO, Scopus, Web of Science, and additional discipline-specific indexes for $21 per article. Ubiquity also publishes monographs and supports an institutional repository. Explore more here: https://www.ubiquitypress.com/site/journals/
- Michigan Publishing - Michigan Publishing is a leader in open-access publishing for academic scholarship in a number of fields and formats. Michigan Publishing offers two best-in-breed open source platforms--Fulcrum for monographs and Janeway for

serials--and can coordinate them to meet the unique needs of conference proceeds.Professional editorial services (copyediting, formatting, XML conversion) are available at additional cost.

- Clemson University Press - An association with a university press would signal to readers that the journal observes the most rigorous standards for peer review. Clemson OA journals are currently hosted by bepress (Digital Commons), which features a built-in ms-tracking system, search-engine optimization, and metrics reporting for authors. It also meets accessibility and preservation standards. NASIG would be responsible for production costs (copyediting, typesetting, DOIs, basic staff time).
- Project MUSE - The MUSE platform is well-established and OA content is accessible to those who do not have MUSE subscriptions. Cost is $2,000 annually and includes: article processing costs (XML conversion) indexing in search engines metadata to library discovery systems, some marketing and promotion DOI deposits archiving in Portico and LOCKSS. Explore more here: https://about.muse.jhu.edu/publishers/why-muse-journals/

The committee members provided pros and cons for each platform and summarized their overall findings:

- Costs and support are variable, but as a general rule costs will go up for added support (i.e. copyediting, typesetting, formatting, etc.)
- Without significant additional costs, the Proceedings Editors (and potentially others appointed as needed) will have to take on more responsibilities in the publishing workflow
- Revenue for NASIG not likely with any of these platforms
- Additional considerations: connection to NASIG/NASIG members, publishing The Proceedings as a journal or book, visibility provided by the platform/service

The committee also provided a list of questions for the board to answer as they continue their evaluation:

1. Is there any kind of budget (or budget limit) that has been discussed?
2. Is it important to have an open-source platform in addition to open content?
3. Would the editorial committee be able to take on some of the tasks below if the platform does not offer them, or are these services that need to be provided by the press or hosting service?
   a. Copyediting
   b. Typesetting
   c. Accessibility
   d. Indexing
   e. Print-on-demand

    f. Preservation
  4. What next steps would you like to see from OIC, considering these findings?

The board discussed how much additional copyediting and typesetting would be necessary beyond what the proceedings editors already do. Paul Moeller shared that proceedings editors get the articles as polished as possible, but Taylor and Francis does the typesetting, proofs, and copyright agreements. The proceedings editors already do a considerable amount of work so if NASIG were to take on all of the work that Taylor & Francis is doing as well, there would need to be additional volunteers or paid staff to do the additional tasks.

The board discussed how much additional copyediting and typesetting would be necessary to turn out a comparable product that could also be ready for print on demand as well as online access and discovery. University Presses, like Michigan and Clemson, require a level of copyediting that may not be required for other platforms, potentially including in-house copyediting, a style guide, consistency of the style guide across all published articles. Library publishing units might have fewer requirements. Keondra asked if the committee had looked at Duke University Press. The committee said that they had not, but that they would be interested. Keondra will get the appropriate Duke University Press representative in touch with the committee.

The board discussed getting estimates from each of the platforms for the costs of copyediting and typesetting per article. The committee asked if the board knew how many articles that we might be publishing with the open access proceedings. The board and committee discussed polling current presenters and the wider NASIG membership to see how many presenters and potential presenters want to write a paper for the proceedings when they present at NASIG. Proceedings are both for the NASIG to share content with people who can't make it to the conference as well as a publishing outlet for NASIG presenters so it is important to balance both of those services to the membership.

The board and committee discussed whether we have time to do a survey if we want to have the new platform chosen for the 2022 proceedings by the time we have the 2021 conference. We are publishing the 2021 proceedings with Taylor & Francis. Taylor & Francis would probably be willing to work with us one more year (2022) if it meant us making a more-informed choice that works for the membership. If we are considering doing one more year with Taylor & Francis we would want to follow up with that conversation now.

Michael Fernandez shared that if the committee and the board wanted to put together a survey the Evaluation and Assessment committee would help with getting it into survey monkey and distributing it to the membership. We would also want to get feedback from the program planning and proceedings editors as well. The board discussed asking the membership about whether they or their organizations would be willing to support the OA proceedings with

increased dues or other contributions. The board discussed that the recent membership rate increase was done with the OA proceedings in mind. We could also ask in a survey how people might feel about a small typesetting APC.

ACTION ITEM: The open initiatives committee and the board will come up with survey questions for the membership about their desire to publish in the NASIG proceedings. The evaluation and assessment committee will help to format and distribute the survey.

ACTION ITEM: Cris Ferguson will work with memberships services to see if the membership rate increase led to more funds for the OA proceedings.

3.0 Treasurer's Report

Recently completed work
- Updated paperwork on NASIG's PMB
- Contacted NISO about invoice - agreed to half price on this year's invoice

Account Balances as of 12/8/2020
- Checking Account - $31,402.24
- Savings Account - $11,596.94
- Investment Accounts - approximately $323,000

Recent Expenses
- $1,411.95 Credit Card Payment
- BeeNet - $500 - This is billed monthly. Should be cancelled as soon as we are sure SimpleLists is handling our email lists in the way we want.
- Zoom - $42
- Proposal Space - $472.50
- Proposal Space - $15.00

Upcoming Expenses
- Credit Card Payment - $1029.50
- NISO Invoice - $1015

4.0 Adjourn
The meeting was adjourned at 2:10 pm Eastern. Minutes submitted by: Beth Ashmore, Secretary, NASIG Executive Board.