Open Access Policy: Selected Implementation Considerations for Discussion

SLASIAC Conference Call

May 7, 2012

The CDL has begun an investigation of the requirements for the successful implementation of the UC Open Access Policy. This investigation is being conducted in parallel with system-wide discussions about the policy in an effort to inform this discussion and anticipate any implementation challenges or resource requirements that may emerge should the policy be formalized by the Faculty Senate.

Recognizing the potential knowledge to be gained from other institutions that have preceded us in this effort, we have recently conducted interviews with staff at Harvard (Stuart Shieber and Suzanne Kriegsman) and MIT (Ellen Finnie Duranceau), who have worked directly on the development and implementation of OA policies at their institutions. These discussions have been extremely helpful as indicators of the types of methodologies that could be employed by UC.

Below is a collection of high-level topics/questions for discussion:

Questions:

1. **Scope of implementation:** Should there be an attempt to aggregate a comprehensive record of all research articles published by UC faculty? What about all open access output? What to do about articles where the author has opted out of the policy?

   The current draft (April 20) of the policy states: “In cases where the application of the license has been waived or access has been delayed, the article will be archived in a University of California repository without open access for the specified period.”

   Note that the eScholarship repository does not currently function as a “dark” archive - it is by definition open access. However the capability to implement this requirement can be built in to systems at the CDL.

2. **Multiple copies:** Are there significant concerns about the existence of multiple copies of a paper (e.g., that is deposited in more than one repository) and aggregating article statistics/metrics?

3. **Deposit:** How should the deposit mechanism work?

   Although the policy states that authors will “provide an electronic copy,” a significant portion of the articles can be automatically “harvested” from publishers or aggregators. For those that cannot be harvested, faculty will need to make some effort to ensure deposit. In the later case especially, local resources will need to be dedicated to provide uploading assistance (if needed),
rights-management (for clarification about contracts, versions), metadata, and cataloging. There will also have to be an information/education component. How best can we support implementation at a harvesting and local deposit level?

4. **Assessment:** How should the University track participation and assess the policy's impact?

The Policy draft states that the policy will be reviewed after three years. Maintaining a record of UC’s Open Access publishing activities might also be useful in negotiations with publishers, requests for resources to support the policy, etc. It will not be simple to track the rate of faculty participation if articles are deposited in various repositories rather than being aggregated in a single local repository.