FAC Resources related to Open Access Changes

Recent Open Access (OA) requirements as well as responses to them by publishers have affected (and will likely continue to affect) publication opportunities for faculty. Here, we provide some background on the OA movement, detail on some OA requirements, links to relevant CU resources, and resources for better understanding several issues and controversies around OA. We also recommend to units several reviews and discussions to undertake that might better position units to proactively address impacts on their faculty as well as several policies and practices to consider for mitigating those potential impacts.

I: Background and context
    a. OA as broader movement, OSTP memo guidance, mandates
        Berlin Declaration (early movement manifesto), Budapest Open Access Initiative
        Plan S and Coalition S (webpage from European pro-OA advocacy group)
        Guidance for Public Access to Federally Funded Research, OSTP report to Congress
        Higher Education Leadership Initiative for Open Scholarship (US-based NGO)
        "Open Access Takes Flight" (descriptive recent history, from Science, 2021)
        DataCite Joint Statement on Research Data (best practices recommendations)
    b. OA policy, practice, and resources at CU
        CU-Boulder Open Access Policy (waivers from entire policy, for articles)
        CU-Boulder Open Access Fund (through Libraries, up to $2K/year for articles)
        CU-Boulder Open Monograph Fund (up to four/year)
        Support for Open Access Resources and Publishing (including publishing agreements)
        CU Scholar (login page for campus repository)
        State Of Open at CU-Boulder (2022 update of campus open access practices)
        Case study on CU Boulder open access policy compliance

II: Issues and controversies around OA
    a. Overview of challenges, pros/cons
        "The challenge of open access initiatives" (from *Science*, 2022)
        Dutch website on pros and cons of OA publishing
    b. Article processing charges
        "Is Open Access Worth the Cost?" (Op-ed on article processing charges in *The Scientist*, 2022)
    c. OA mandates and academic freedom
        "An Open Letter to the AAUP" (2018 Op-ed against OA mandates in *The Scholarly Kitchen*)
    d. OA pressures and impacts on journal quality/standing
        Open access-driven collapse at JPP (how cost pressures killed a top-tier journal, Wiley on OA)
    e. Predatory publishing
        Discussion of concerns about potentially predatory journals and publishers

III: Recommended unit-level reviews and discussions
    a. Impacts on journal landscape for unit faculty/discipline
        ● Which journals are paywalled, which have OA options, which have agreements with CU?
        ● Have journal rankings/tiers been affected by OA pressures? How so?
    b. Impacts of APCs (article processing charges) on faculty, funding for APCs
        ● How many articles/books with OA APCs? Overall costs of APCs?
        ● How are they being paid? Through grants? Library fund? By faculty? By unit?
        ● Are funds adequate for offsetting APCs? Are faculty avoiding OA due to costs?

IV: Potential unit-level policies, practices, discussions
   a. Statements regarding OA, inclusion within merit criteria, effects on journal rankings
      [CU-Boulder Libraries merit standard statement](see pp. 22-3)
   b. Recognition of/support for additional work needed for OA publishing (i.e., if some but not other faculty, either from mandates or goals, must do significant extra work to publish OA)
   c. Equity in publishing opportunities within unit (i.e., differential access to resources like grants to fund OA publishing, differentiated OA requirements by field, other differentiated impacts)
   d. Unit-level policies/practices related to unit support for OA (e.g. APC offsets by units)
   e. Considerations of [zero-cost routes to OA](e.g. self-archiving; CU Scholar institutional repository)

FAC Resources related to Open Access Changes

Recent Open Access (OA) requirements as well as responses to them by publishers have affected (and will likely continue to affect) publication opportunities for faculty. Here, we provide some background on the OA movement, detail on some OA requirements, links to relevant CU resources, and resources for better understanding several issues and controversies around OA. We also recommend to units several reviews and discussions to undertake that might better position units to proactively address impacts on their faculty as well as several policies and practices to consider for mitigating those potential impacts.

I: Background and context
OA began as an international movement for access to knowledge, with the 2003 Berlin Declaration serving as an early manifesto) and the 2001 Budapest Open Access Initiative an early statement of principles and strategy. Current OA advocates like Plan S and Coalition S (launched in 2018) continue this work with a set of OA principles in effect since 2021 along with numerous OA advocacy resources.

Within the US, the OA movement was given force by this 2022 OSTP memo, which requires that federally funded research by published OA (see CU's guidance page and the OSTP report to Congress). The Higher Education Leadership Initiative for Open Scholarship (HELIOS) is a US-based cohort of universities that share OA commitments and resources, "Open Access Takes Flight" (*Science*, 2021) offers a recent history of OA initiatives, and DataCite's Joint Statement on Research Data recommends a set of best practices.

For more on CU OA policy, practice, and resources, see the CU-Boulder Open Access Policy (waivers from entire policy, for articles), the CU-Boulder Open Access Fund (through Libraries, with up to $2K/year for articles), the CU-Boulder Open Monograph Fund (up to four/year), the site on Support for Open Access Resources and Publishing (including publishing agreements), CU Scholar (the login page for CU's campus repository), State Of Open at CU-Boulder (a 2022 update of campus open access practices), and this Case study on CU Boulder open access policy compliance.

II: Issues and controversies around OA
OA goals and directives, along with responses to them by publishers, are not without controversy. For an overview of challenges, see "The challenge of open access initiatives" (from *Science*, 2022); for pros and cons of OA publishing, see this Dutch website. Without a subscription model to finance publishing costs, OA directives have shifted costs onto authors in the form of article processing charges (APCs). In addition to creating new financial and data management burdens for researchers, APCs strain library budgets, may limit access to author access to some journals and/or impact journal quality, and create incentives for predatory publishing. For an op-ed that critically discusses such impacts, see "Is Open Access Worth the Cost?" (from *The Scientist*, 2022). For an op-ed critical of OA mandates for their impacts on academic freedom, see "An Open Letter to the AAUP" (from *The Scholarly Kitchen*, 2018). For a cautionary tale of OA pressures that allegedly led to the collapse of a top-tier philosophy journal, see this blog post at *Daily Nous* (along with Wiley's position on OA). Concerns about predatory publishing have led to the creation of (themselves controversial) lists of predatory publishers and journals that scholars and librarians are warned against supporting. For resources on identifying and avoiding potentially predatory publishers, see ThinkCheckSubmit (which discusses watch lists) as well as the Directory of Open Access Journals.

III: Recommended unit-level reviews and discussions

In addition to sharing information with unit faculty about OA directives and the available CU and external resources for complying with them, we recommend that chairs/directors or faculty committees explore how OA requirements have affected journals in fields covered by the unit as well as surveying impacts of APCs within the unit on various budgets. Questions related to impacts on unit faculty or journals include:

- Which journals are paywalled, which have OA options, which have agreements with CU?
- Have journal rankings/tiers been affected by OA pressures? How so?
- How many articles/books with OA APCs? Overall costs of APCs?
- How are they being paid? Through grants? Library fund? By faculty? By unit?
- Are funds adequate for offsetting APCs? Are faculty avoiding OA due to costs?

Such audits should allow units to better understand current and future impacts on budgets as well as on the standing of field journals and publishing access for unit faculty as well as facilitating the planning for and/or assessment of unit and/or campus programs for financing OA publishing.

IV: Potential unit-level policies, practices, and discussions
We also recommend that chairs/directors of faculty committees consider creation of and/or changes to various unit-level policies and practices related to OA publishing directive and their impacts, initiating relevant discussions within the unit. These include consideration of statements regarding OA objectives, whether in bylaws or merit criteria (see pp. 22-23 of CU-Boulder Libraries merit standard statement), updated journal ranking tiers that reflect changes resulting from OA cost pressures, publisher compliance with OA principles, or identifying potentially predatory journals in relevant fields. In addition, units may consider recognition of or support for the additional work needed for OA publishing (i.e., if some but not other faculty, either from mandates or goals, must do significant extra work to publish OA), may want to determine if OA directives and/or market response have created inequities in publishing opportunities within the unit (e.g. through, differential access to resources like grants to fund OA publishing, through differentiated OA requirements by fields within the unit or other differentiated impacts), and if so also consider how such inequities might be mitigated. If they have not done so already, units should consider developing policies/practices related to unit support for OA that ensure fair and equitable access to OA publishing resources and/or ensure that OA impacts do not create new inequities among faculty. Units should also consider and share with their faculty the various zero-cost routes to OA (e.g. self-archiving; CU Scholar institutional repository) in order to reduce and more equitable share OA publishing costs.