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Things that cost money

- Doing research
- Turning research results into publishable documents
- Making documents available
- Archiving and curating documents
Who undertakes the costs

- **Funding agencies (public/private)**
  - Supported by tax dollars, endowments

- **Academic institutions (public/private)**
  - Supported by tax dollars, tuition, endowments

- **Publishers (for-profit/not-for-profit)**
  - Supported by sales revenue, membership fees
Problems

- Economic
  - quickly-rising prices and stagnant budgets

- Philosophical
  - “paying for the same content twice” (sort of)
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Open Access (OA) models

- Gold: institutional subsidy or author fee
- Green: traditional publication with OA deposit
Gold OA: Upsides and downsides

- Funding source
  - institutional subsidy
  - author fee

- Upsides
  - free public access
  - broad dissemination

- Downsides:
  - redirected research funding (author-pay model)
  - redirected institutional funding (subsidy)
  - perverse incentives
Green OA: Upsides and downsides

- **Funding source**
  - subscription revenues (publisher)
  - institutional subsidy (repository)

- **Upsides**
  - free public access
  - broad dissemination

- **Downsides:**
  - undermines subscription revenue
  - perverse incentives
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ROARMAP is a remarkable, increasingly transformational #openaccess work by @amsciforum, so naturally a target for scholarlykitchen.sspnet.org/2014/02/13/err...
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More Skulduggery from SSP's Scholarly Scullery
Open Access Archivangelism

More Skulduggery from SSP's Scholarly Scullery

In the Society for Scholarly Publishing's Scholarly Kitchen, Rick Anderson complains of "errors and misinformation" in the ROARMAP registry of OA mandates and calls for publishers to provide this service instead.

ROARMAP is a registry for institutional and funder OA policies:

X-Other (Non-Mandates) (86)
Proposed Institutional Mandates (6)
Proposed Sub-Institutional Mandate (4)
Proposed Multi-Institutional Mandates (5)
Proposed Funder Mandates (12)
Institutional Mandates (202)
Sub-Institutional Mandates (43)
Multi-Institutional Mandates (9)
Funder Mandates (87)
Thesis Mandates (109)

The distinction between a mandate and a non-mandate is fuzzy, because mandates vary in strength.

For a classification of the ROARMAP policies in terms of WHERE and WHEN to deposit, and whether the deposit is REQUIRED or REQUESTED, see El CSIC's (la Universitat de Barcelona, la Universitat de València & la Universitat Oberta de Catalunya) MELIBEA.

For analyses of mandate strength and effectiveness, see:
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Shockling stuff from the AHA, which calls for a SIX-year dissertation embargo. Regressive and reactive.
blog.historians.org/2013/07/ameri...
2:18 PM - 22 Jul 2013
15 RETWEETS 1 FAVORITE

More from the dumb as a box of hair department: Why I Embargoed My Dissertation zite.to/1aJOZak via @zite #ahagate
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AHA recommends PhDs embargo their ETDs:
blog.historians.org/2013/07/americ...
1:13 PM - 22 Jul 2013

I am speechless. Hopefully @dancohen won't be. // AHA recommends PhDs embargo their ETDs for _SIX_ years:
blog.historians.org/2013/07/americ...

I'm laughing about AHA's call to embargo dissertations. Good luck with that. Why weren't they up in arms about UMI? blog.historians.org/2013/07/americ...

1:21 PM - 22 Jul 2013
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Who's Afraid of Peer Review?

John Bohannon

A spoof paper concocted by *Science* reveals little or no scrutiny at many open-access journals.

On 4 July, good news arrived in the inbox of Ocorrafoo Cobange, a biologist at the Wassee Institute of Medicine in Asmara. It was the official letter of acceptance for a paper he had submitted 2 months earlier to the *Journal of Natural Pharmaceuticals*, describing the anticancer properties of a chemical that Cobange had extracted from a lichen.
Rational discussion and its discontents

- Flag-waving vs. analysis
  - “Universal OA is inevitable”
  - “OA’s inexorable progress”
  - “OA’s remarkable/dramatic growth”

- Magical thinking vs. reality
  - “Open Access is the norm”
  - “Funding research means funding dissemination” (or “Taxpayer access to publicly-funded research”)
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What each of us can do

- Acknowledge that no model of scholarly communication is perfect
- Comprehend first; respond second
- Focus on the substance of the statement, not the supposed motivations of the speaker
- Avoid “poisoned well” and *ad hominem* argumentation
- Take unintended and unexpected consequences seriously
- Invite all stakeholders to the table
Discuss!

rick.anderson@utah.edu