



J. Willard Marriott Library

THE UNIVERSITY OF UTAH

Is a Rational Discussion of Open Access Possible?

Rick Anderson

Associate Dean for Scholarly Resources & Collections



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)



Things that cost money

- Doing research
- Turning research results into publishable documents
- Making documents available
- Archiving and curating documents



Things that cost money

- Doing research
- Turning research results into publishable documents
- ~~Making documents available~~
- Archiving and curating documents



Things that cost money

- Doing research
- Turning research results into publishable documents
- ~~Making documents available~~
- Archiving and curating documents



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



Rational discussion and its discontents



Rational discussion and its discontents

ROARMAP is a remarkable, increasingly transformational [#openaccess](#) work by [@amsciforum](#), so naturally a target for scholarlykitchen.sspnet.org/2014/02/13/err...

Expand

Reply Retweet Favorite More

Rational discussion and its discontents

More Skulduggery from SSP's Scholarly Scullery Open Access Archivangelism

Saturday, February 15, 2014

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:



Rational discussion and its discontents





Shocking stuff from the AHA, which calls for a SIX-year dissertation embargo. Regressive and reactive.
blog.historians.org/2013/07/americ...

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](https://twitter.com/zite) [#ahagate](https://twitter.com/ahagate)

Expand  Reply  Retweet  Favorite  More

Rational discussion and its discontents






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



Rational discussion and its discontents

The screenshot shows the Science journal website interface. At the top, there is a navigation bar with the Science logo, AAAS.ORG, FEEDBACK, HELP, and LIBRARIANS. A search bar is on the right. Below this is a red navigation bar with NEWS, SCIENCE JOURNALS, CAREERS, MULTIMEDIA, and COLLECTIONS. The main content area features the Science logo and the tagline 'The World's Leading Journal of Original Scientific Research, Global News, and Commentary.' Below this are links for Science Home, Current Issue, Previous Issues, Science Express, Science Products, My Science, and About the Journal. The article path is: Home > Science Magazine > 4 October 2013 > Bohannon, 342 (6154): 60-65. The article title is 'Who's Afraid of Peer Review?' by John Bohannon. The abstract reads: 'A spoof paper concocted by Science reveals little or no scrutiny at many open-access journals.' The article is part of a 'SPECIAL SECTION' titled 'COMMUNICATION IN SCIENCE'. The left sidebar contains 'Article Views' (Summary, Full Text, Full Text (PDF), Data and Documents, Podcast Interview) and 'Article Tools' (Leave a comment (230), Save to My Folders, Download Citation, Alert Me When Article).

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”)



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

J. Willard Marriott Library