Communication from the Chair of the Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication
Richard A. Schneider, PhD, Chair

May 4, 2012

MEMBERS OF THE UCSF ACADEMIC SENATE

RE: Divisional Vote on an Open Access Policy for UCSF

Dear Colleagues,

The predominant system for scholarly communication has become economically unsustainable, restrictive, and critically limited in its ability to disseminate our research. We are asking you to endorse a policy that will make our publications more accessible and ultimately help control costs.

Despite our University’s diminishing budget, there remains a real need to access increasing amounts of scholarly materials. The costs of purchasing such materials continue to rise exponentially due largely to aggressive practices of many commercial publishers who extract billions of dollars in profits every year from the business of scholarly communication, particularly in the digital marketplace.

Traditional “fee-for-access” publishing models restrict the distribution of scholarly publications to those who can afford journal subscriptions or per-article download prices. System-wide, UC spends more than $40 million dollars annually to access scholarly materials, including the work of UC authors, which we give away, edit, and peer-review for free. Most other Universities and especially the taxpaying public have substantially less access, and thus our research is not achieving its full impact. Even if we had unlimited amounts of money and could keep up with the pricing of commercial publishers, there are many other reasons to transform the current system of scholarly communication.

Accordingly, the Academic Senate Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication (COLASC) has worked closely with the System-Wide Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication (UCOLASC) to develop an Open Access Policy that we anticipate will be adopted by all ten UC campuses. This policy is very similar to those already in place at more than 140 other peer Institutions, including Harvard, Stanford, MIT, Duke, and Princeton. Although these policies vary in some details, at their core they operate in the same way: by default Faculty grant their Institution permission to disseminate their scholarship freely through an open-access repository. These policies all allow Faculty members to deny or delay this permission very easily (that is, to trigger a waiver of the policy) for any specific work—no questions asked. UCSF is ready to vote on such a policy, which has been vetted through Academic Senate Committees and Faculty Councils. Their letters of support are enclosed. Also enclosed is the policy itself, some FAQs, and an accompanying slide presentation that contextualizes the various complex issues related to scholarly communication. If you have any questions about these materials or the policy, please do not hesitate to contact me directly.
As Faculty authors, you can empower viable alternatives to the present system, regain control over your publications, and increase the reach, visibility, and impact of your research. We look forward to your attendance and vote at the May 21st Division Meeting, which will be held from noon-2pm in room HSW-300 on Parnassus and the Arthur and Toni Rembe Auditorium in Rock Hall at Mission Bay.

On behalf of the numerous individuals and committees that have worked tirelessly on this policy, I thank you in advance for your help in reshaping the future of scholarly communication at UCSF.

Yours truly,

Richard A. Schneider, PhD
Chair, Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication
rich.schneider@ucsf.edu
415-502-3788

Enclosures: Letters of Support
Open Access Policy
Open Access Policy FAQ
Open Access Policy Presentation
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2. [Open Access Policy](#)

3. [Open Access Policy FAQ](#)

4. [Open Access Policy Presentation](#)
Communication from the Coordinating Committee  
Robert Newcomer, PhD, Chair

May 13, 2012

Richard Schneider, PhD, Chair  
Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication  
Office of the Academic Senate, Box 0764

Re: Support for a UCSF Open Access Policy

Dear Chair Schneider,

Thank you for taking the time this past month to present the background and proposed Open Access policy to each of the campus’ standing committees, and for your May 7, 2012 presentation at our UCSF Coordinating Committee. I am writing to express our enthusiastic support for the Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication Open Access Policy for UCSF. We concur that such a policy will ultimately make scholarly information more readily available and help UCSF faculty retain rights to their creative works.

The Coordinating Committee unanimously endorses the creation of an Open Access Policy as a first step toward addressing current copyright issues and publication barriers that threaten access to research by scholars and the public at large. The Coordinating Committee stands ready to assist the San Francisco Division of the Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication in its dissemination and realization.

Also, this issue has been placed on the May 21 agenda for the Division Senate meeting where we will be asking for a Division endorsement for the Open Access policy.

Sincerely,

Robert Newcomer, PhD, Chair
Communication from Committee on Academic Freedom
Mohana Amirtharajah, MD, Chair

May 11, 2012

Richard Schneider, PhD, Chair
Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication
Office of the Academic Senate, Box 0764

Re: Support for a UCSF Open Access Policy

Dear Chair Schneider,

The Committee on Academic Freedom, after hearing your presentation on April 20, 2012, writes to enthusiastically support the Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication Open Access Policy for UCSF. We concur that such a policy will ultimately make scholarly information more readily available and help UCSF faculty retain rights to their creative works.

We strongly and unanimously endorse the creation of an Open Access Policy as a first step toward addressing current copyright issues and publication barriers that threaten access to research by scholars and the public at large. The Committee on Academic Freedom stands ready to assist the San Francisco Division of the Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication in its dissemination and realization.

Sincerely,

UCSF Committee on Academic Freedom

Mohana Amirtharajah, MD, Chair, Orthopaedic Surgery
Thuan Le, DDS, Vice Chair, Orofacial Sciences
Catherine (Kit) Chesla, RN, DNS, FAAN, Family Health Care Nursing
Robin Corelli, PharmD, Clinical Pharmacy
Mark Hawk, RN, MSN, ACNP, Physiological Nursing
Roberta Keller, MD, Pediatrics
Communication from the Committee on Academic Personnel
Paul Garcia, PhD, Chair

May 8, 2012

Richard Schneider, PhD
Chair, Committee on Library & Scholarly Communication
500 Parnassus Avenue, MUE 230

Re: Support for Open Access Policy at UCSF

Dear Rich,

The Committee on Academic Personnel appreciated your attendance at their April 18, 2012 meeting to discuss the proposed Open Access Policy at UCSF.

The Committee appreciates the attention the Academic Senate’s Committee on Library & Scholarly Communication has paid to this topic since its initial discussion in 2006. It recognizes that other academic institutions including Harvard University have developed and implemented Open Access Publication Policies based on UCSF’s initial research and plan.

Committee members support passage of the proposed policy at UCSF. They further recommend that library resources be directed to the development of a funding pool to support faculty publishing in Open Access journals.

Sincerely,

Committee of Academic Personnel

Paul Garcia, MD, Chair, Neurology
Pat Fox, PhD, Vice Chair, Institute for Health & Aging
Ann Bolger, MD, Cardiology (SFCH)
David Glidden, PhD, Epidemiology & Biostatistics
Thomas Kearney, PharmD, Clinical Pharmacy
Arthur Miller, PhD, Orofacial Sciences
Jean Olson, MD, Pathology
Lynn Pulliam, PhD, Laboratory Medicine
Rita Redberg, MD, MS, Cardiology
Communication from the Committee on Academic Planning and Budget
Mary Gray, MD, Chair

May 11, 2012

Richard Schneider, PhD, Chair
Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication
Office of the Academic Senate, Box 0764

Re: Support for a UCSF Open Access Policy

Dear Chair Schneider,

The Committee on Academic Planning and Budget, after hearing your presentation on May 3, 2012, writes to enthusiastically support the Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication Open Access Policy for UCSF. We concur that such a policy will ultimately make scholarly information more readily available and help UCSF faculty retain rights to their creative works.

We strongly and unanimously endorse the creation of an Open Access Policy as a first step toward addressing current copyright issues and publication barriers that threaten access to research by scholars and the public at large. The Committee on Academic Planning and Budget stands ready to assist the San Francisco Division of the Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication in its dissemination and realization.

Sincerely,

UCSF Committee on Academic Planning and Budget

Mary Gray, MD, Chair, Medicine (Cardiology)
David Teitel, MD, Vice Chair, Medicine (Cardiology)
Barbara Drew, RN, PhD, FAAN, Physiological Nursing
Jacque Duncan, MD, Ophthalmology
OiSaeng Hong, RN, PhD, Community Health Systems
Helene Lipton, PhD, Clinical Pharmacy
Sharmilia Majumdar, PhD, Radiology
Snehlata Oberoi, BDDS, MBS, Orofacial Sciences
Fred Schaufele, PhD, Diabetes Center
Michael Steinman, MD, Medicine/Geriatrics
Jonathan Strober, MD, Neurology
Ellen Weber, MD, Emergency Medicine
Sanda Weiss, RN, DNS, PhD, FAAN, Community Health Systems
Elad Ziv, MD, Medicine (GIM)
Communication from Committee on Educational Policy
Abbey Alkon, RN, PhD, PNP, Chair

May 15, 2012

Richard Schneider, PhD, Chair
Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication
Office of the Academic Senate, Box 0764

Re: Support for a UCSF Open Access Policy

Dear Chair Schneider,

The Committee on Educational Policy writes to enthusiastically support the Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication Open Access Policy for UCSF. We concur that such a policy will ultimately make scholarly information more readily available and help UCSF faculty retain rights to their creative works.

We strongly and unanimously endorse the creation of an Open Access Policy as a first step toward addressing current copyright issues and publication barriers that threaten access to research by scholars and the public at large. The Committee on Educational Policy stands ready to assist the San Francisco Division of the Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication in its dissemination and realization.

Sincerely,

UCSF Committee on Educational Policy

Abbey Alkon, RN, PhD, PNP, Chair, UCEP Representative (Family Health Care Nursing) (N)
Elisabeth Wilson, MD, MPH, Vice Chair (Family and Community Medicine) (M)
Tamara Alliston, PhD (Orthopaedics) (M)
Susan Hyde, DDS, MPH, PhD (Preventive & Restorative Dental Sciences) (D)
Nancy Nkansah, PharmD, MBA (Pharmacy Education) (P)
Vineeta Singh, MD (Neurology) (M)
Douglas Schmucker, PhD (Anatomy) (M)
Sophia Saeed, DMD, Clinical Representative (Oral & Maxillofacial Surgery) (D)
Communication from the Committee on Research
Judith Moskowitz, PhD, MPH, Chair

May 11, 2012

Richard Schneider, PhD, Chair
Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication
Office of the Academic Senate, Box 0764

Re: Support for Open Access Policy at UCSF

Dear Chair Schneider,

The Committee on Research appreciated your attendance at our April 16, 2012 meeting to discuss the proposed Open Access Policy at UCSF.

The Committee appreciates the attention the Academic Senate’s Committee on Library & Scholarly Communication has paid to this topic since its initial discussion in 2006. It recognizes that other academic institutions including Harvard University have developed and implemented Open Access Publication Policies based on UCSF’s initial research and plan.

Committee members support passage of the proposed policy at UCSF. We further recommend that library resources be directed to the development of a funding pool to support faculty publishing in Open Access journals.

Sincerely,

Committee on Research

Judith Moskowitz, PhD, MPH, Chair (Osher Center for Integrative Medicine)
Srikantan Nagarajan, PhD, Vice Chair, Professor in Residence (Radiology)
Dorie Apollonio, PhD (Clinical Pharmacy)
Laura Dunn, MD (Psychiatry)
Diana Foster, PhD (Obstetrics, Gynecology and Reproductive Sciences)
Stuart Gansky, MS, DPH (Preventive & Restorative Dental Sciences)
Judith Hahn, PhD, MA (Medicine)
Robert Hendren, DO (Psychiatry)
Sunita Ho, MS, PhD (Preventive & Restorative Dental Sciences)
Gary Humfleet, PhD (Psychiatry)
Laura Julian, PhD (Rheumatology)
Celia Kaplan, DPH (General Internal Medicine)
Susan Kools, RN, PhD, FAAN (Family Health Care Nursing)
Kirby Lee, PharmD (Clinical Pharmacy)

Wu Li, PhD (Orofacial Sciences)
Ralph Marcucio, PhD (Orthopaedic Surgery)
Janet Myers, PhD, MPH (Medicine/CAPS)
Vineeta Singh, MD (Neurology)
Michael West, MD, PhD (Surgery)
Duan Xu, PhD (Radiology)
Communication from the School of Dentistry Faculty Council
Stefan Habelitz, PhD, Chair

May 17, 2012

Richard Schneider, PhD, Chair
Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication
Office of the Academic Senate, Box 0764

Re: Support for a UCSF Open Access Policy

Dear Chair Schneider,

The School of Dentistry Faculty Council, after hearing your presentation on May 17, 2012, writes to enthusiastically support the Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication Open Access Policy for UCSF. We concur that such a policy will ultimately make scholarly information more readily available and help UCSF faculty retain rights to their creative works.

We strongly and unanimously endorse the creation of an Open Access Policy as a first step toward addressing current copyright issues and publication barriers that threaten access to research by scholars and the public at large. The School of Dentistry Faculty Council stands ready to assist the San Francisco Division of the Academic Senate Committee on Library in its dissemination and realization.

Sincerely,

UCSF School of Dentistry Faculty Council

Stefan Habelitz, PhD, Chair, Preventive and Restorative Dental Sciences
Torsten Wittmann, PhD, Vice Chair, Cell and Tissue Biology
Linda Centore, RN, PhD, Preventive and Restorative Dental Sciences
Donald Curtis, DMD, Preventive and Restorative Dental Sciences
Sunita Ho, MS, PhD, Preventive and Restorative Dental Sciences
Mehran Hossaini, DMD, Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery
Peter Loomer, DDS, PhD, Orofacial Sciences (Secretary)
Sophia Saeed, DMD, Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery
Steven Silverstein, DMD, Preventive and Restorative Dental Sciences
Communication from the School of Medicine Faculty Council
Robert Nissenson, PhD, Chair

May 11, 2012

Richard Schneider, PhD, Chair
Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication
Office of the Academic Senate, Box 0764

Re: Support for a UCSF Open Access Policy

Dear Chair Schneider,

The School of Medicine Faculty Council, after hearing your presentation on April 19, 2012, writes to enthusiastically support the Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication Open Access Policy for UCSF. We concur that such a policy will ultimately make scholarly information more readily available and help UCSF faculty retain rights to their creative works.

We strongly and unanimously endorse the creation of an Open Access Policy as a first step toward addressing current copyright issues and publication barriers that threaten access to research by scholars and the public at large. The School of Medicine Faculty Council stands ready to assist the San Francisco Division of the Committee on Library in its dissemination and realization.

Sincerely,

UCSF School of Medicine Faculty Council

Robert Nissenson, PhD, Chair (Medicine and Physiology)
Joseph Sullivan, MD, Vice Chair (Neurology)
Marcelle Cedars, MD (Obstetrics, Gynecology and Reproductive Sciences)
Cynthia Curry, MD (Pediatrics)
Teresa De Marco, MD (Cardiology)
Celia Kaplan, DPH (General Internal Medicine)
Jeffrey Lotz, PhD (Orthopaedic Surgery)
Alma Martinez, MD, MPH (Pediatrics Neonatology)

Heather Nye, MD, PhD (Hospitalist)
Phil Rosenthal, MD (Pediatrics – Gastroenterology)
Joseph Speidel, MD, MPH (Obstetrics, Gynecology and Reproductive Sciences)
Ellen Weber, MD (Emergency Medicine)
Communication from the School of Nursing Faculty Council
Jyu-Lin Chen, RN, PhD, Chair

May 11, 2012

Richard Schneider, PhD, Chair
Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication
Office of the Academic Senate, Box 0764

Re: Support for a UCSF Open Access Policy

Dear Chair Schneider,

The School of Nursing Faculty Council, after hearing your presentation on April 20, 2012, writes to enthusiastically support the Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication Open Access Policy for UCSF. We concur that such a policy will ultimately make scholarly information more readily available and help UCSF faculty retain rights to their creative works.

We strongly and unanimously endorse the creation of an Open Access Policy as a first step toward addressing current copyright issues and publication barriers that threaten access to research by scholars and the public at large. The School of Nursing Faculty Council stands ready to assist the San Francisco Division of the Committee on Library in its dissemination and realization.

Sincerely,

UCSF School of Nursing Faculty Council

Jyu-Lin Chen, RN, PhD, Chair, Family Health Care Nursing
Shari L. Dworkin, PhD, MS, Vice Chair, Social and Behavioral Sciences
Brad Aouizerat, PhD, Physiological Nursing
Gerri Collins-Bride, RN, MS, ANP, Community Health Systems
Karen Duderstadt, RN, PhD, FAAN, Family Health Care Nursing
Jill Howie Esquivel, RN, PhD, NP, Physiological Nursing
Susan Janson, RN, DNS, ANP, FAAN, Community Health Systems
Hai-Yen Sung, PhD, Institute for Health and Aging


Communication from the School of Pharmacy Faculty Council
Norman Oppenheimer, PhD, Chair

May 11, 2012

Richard Schneider, PhD, Chair
Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication
Office of the Academic Senate, Box 0764

Re: Support for a UCSF Open Access Policy

Dear Chair Schneider,

The School of Pharmacy Faculty Council, after hearing your presentation on May 10, 2012, writes to enthusiastically support the Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication Open Access Policy for UCSF. We concur that such a policy will ultimately make scholarly information more readily available and help UCSF faculty retain rights to their creative works.

We strongly and unanimously endorse the creation of an Open Access Policy as a first step toward addressing current copyright issues and publication barriers that threaten access to research by scholars and the public at large. The School of Pharmacy Faculty Council stands ready to assist the San Francisco Division of the Academic Senate Committee on Library in its dissemination and realization.

Sincerely,

UCSF School of Pharmacy Faculty Council

Norman Oppenheimer, PhD, Chair, Pharmaceutical Chemistry
Ruth Greenblatt, MD, Vice Chair, Clinical Pharmacy
Nadav Ahituv, PhD, Bioengineering and Therapeutic Sciences
Brian Alldredge, PharmD, Clinical Pharmacy
Mitra Asemi, PharmD, Clinical Pharmacy
Tina Brock, EdD, MS, BSPPharm, Clinical Pharmacy
Patrick Finley, PharmD, Clinical Pharmacy
Thomas James, PhD, Pharmaceutical Chemistry
Sue Miller, PhD, Pharmaceutical Chemistry
Shuvo Roy, PhD, Bioengineering and Therapeutic Sciences
Bill Soller, PhD, Clinical Pharmacy
Ellie Vogt, RPh, PhD, Clinical Pharmacy
The Faculty of The University of California at San Francisco (UCSF) is committed to disseminating its research and scholarship as widely as possible, and as members of a public university system, is dedicated specifically to making its scholarship available to the people of California. Thus, the Faculty adopts the following policy:

For the purpose of open dissemination, each Faculty member grants to The Regents of the University of California, a nonexclusive, irrevocable, worldwide license to exercise any and all rights under copyright relating to each of his or her scholarly articles, in any medium, provided that the articles are not sold, and to authorize others to do the same. The policy applies to all scholarly articles authored or co-authored while the person is a member of the Faculty except for any articles completed before the adoption of this policy and any articles for which the Faculty member entered into an incompatible licensing or assignment agreement before the adoption of this policy. This policy does not transfer copyright ownership, which remains with Faculty authors under existing University of California policy. Application of the license will be waived for a particular article or access delayed for a specified period of time upon express direction by a Faculty member to the University of California.

To assist the University in disseminating scholarly articles, each Faculty member will provide an electronic copy of his or her final version of the article to the University of California by the date of publication. The University of California will make the article available in an open-access repository. When appropriate, a Faculty member may instead notify the University of California if the article will be freely available in another repository or as an open-access publication.

The Academic Senate and the University of California will be responsible for implementing this policy, resolving disputes concerning its interpretation and application, and recommending any changes to the Faculty. The Academic Senate and the University of California will review the policy within three years, and present a report to the Faculty.

The Faculty calls upon the Academic Senate and the University of California to develop and monitor a service or mechanism that would render implementation and compliance with the policy as convenient for the Faculty as possible.
Why are we doing this? A UCSF Open Access Policy would be a powerful, collective statement about the Faculty commitment to promote the access to and use of our scholarship by the wider public. The primary aim is to make our scholarship more widely available and accessible. We would assert Faculty control over the publication of scholarly research, and recognize our responsibility for making that process sustainable and true to the intentions of scholars. We would also be sending a strong collective message to commercial publishers about our values and the system we would like to see put in place.

Why does the policy use an automatic license? Why not just let individuals do it themselves? Experience has shown that mere exhortations have little effect on authors’ behavior. Before Congress made it a requirement, participation in the NIH Public Access Policy was optional. During that period, there was only a 4% level of compliance. Opt-out systems achieve much higher degrees of participation than opt-in systems, even while remaining non-coercive. By making a blanket policy, individual Faculty benefit from their membership in the policy-making group. The University can work with publishers on behalf of the Faculty to simplify procedures and broaden access. Without a blanket policy, the unified action benefit of the policy would be vitiated.

What must Faculty do to comply with this policy? The policy operates automatically to give UC a license to make available all scholarly articles. This policy can be communicated to your publisher when signing the copyright license or assignment agreement in the form of a boilerplate addendum, and simply notifies the publisher that any agreement is subject to this prior license. Part of the implementation plan will be to provide a standard addendum for this purpose. Whether you use the addendum or not, the license to UC still will have force.

Does this policy require that I do anything differently or pay for anything? No. You can continue to publish as you always have, in the very same journals, and you do not have to pay to publish your articles or pay to deposit them in an open-access repository. But the intent of the policy is to also to raise awareness that there are other options for your publications, particularly open access journals, which will make your work more widely available. Such options do employ a different financial model for support as described below.

What effect will this have on the ability of Faculty to publish in top-ranked journals? None. The policy is completely agnostic with respect to where a Faculty member chooses to publish: it only requires that Faculty retain the right to make the work available in a repository. If a publisher refuses to publish a work due to the policy, the Faculty member has several options: he or she can choose to publish elsewhere, ask your UL or CDL to negotiate with the publisher, or in the last instance, simply opt out of the application of the license.

Can I opt out of this policy? Yes. The policy allows Faculty members to opt out of making a work open access. If for any reason, the scholar does not want the work to be made publicly available, he or she simply needs to inform UC. The policy does not, however, allow Faculty to opt out of the deposit requirement. We are in essence, agreeing to make a copy of our articles either actually or potentially available freely in a repository.
• Does't this opt-out approach mean that the policy has no teeth? Won't publishers just demand that all authors opt out? Many publishers already allow deposit of articles in their standard agreements, and will have no issue with this policy. A goal of this policy is not to make large publishers capitulate to Faculty demands for open access, but to find ways to make our work have greater impact and accessibility. If there is any message to publishers, it is that we hope they will continue to explore options for more sustainable open access publishing solutions in the future, so that policies such as this one become unnecessary.

• Why require Faculty to deposit an article even if they opt out of the Open Access requirement? There are at least three possible advantages: 1) it allows the Faculty member to change their mind later; 2) it allows an independent entity (UC/CDL) to preserve a copy of any publication in the case that a publisher goes out of business or decides to sell or close a particular journal or venue; and 3) it retains for the Faculty member the right to republish an article in another venue in the case that a publisher refuses permission. An unintended effect might be the creation of a robust archive of UC Faculty publications for the purposes of review for promotion and tenure.

• Would a UC Open Access policy increase Faculty vulnerability to piracy of our intellectual property? Will it enable plagiarism? The policy creates an open access version of a scholarly article covered by copyright. All of the rights and duties that exist in the case of traditional publication remain in the case of the Open Access version, including the ability to prosecute in cases of piracy or plagiarism. If anything, it will deter piracy by allowing access to a freely available version of an article that might otherwise be distributed unlawfully. Plagiarism is something that cannot be addressed by an open access policy.

• What version will I submit to the repository? The policy requires that the author submit the “final version”—which usually means the manuscript copy post-peer review but before a publisher typesets and finalizes it. In the case that the author is publishing in an open access journal, the version submitted might be the final published version.

• Publishers usually require Faculty to check a box indicating transfer of copyright before a paper is published. Would Faculty be in compliance with the policy if they checked the box? Faculty will be free to transfer their copyright to whomever they wish, but articles would henceforth be subject to a pre-existing license. In practice, Faculty may opt out of the Open Access requirement, meaning that the policy requires only that a copy of the pre-publication version of an article be deposited with UC, though not made available. Publishers should be alerted to the policy using a standard addendum. Faculty might also want to think carefully about transferring copyright to any publisher, and instead offer a license. Many Faculty routinely modify their agreements to do just that, and many publishers comply.

• What do Faculty need to do to comply with the policy? Not much. Simply notify the publisher of the policy when signing the final publishing agreement and deposit a copy of the article, upon publication, within UC’s eScholarship open access repository. UC’s eScholarship repository already houses over 7,000 postprints within its more than 45,000 UC-affiliated publications. If your articles are already deposited in PubMed Central per NIH policy, then
you will continue to deposit there with the understanding that a copy will also be harvested and deposited in eScholarship, unless you opt out of this policy altogether. The eScholarship submission process will be quite minimal and involve a simple web form. The UL’s and CDL’s technical teams intend to refine this process further by developing a system that, upon receipt of a document, will harvest all of that publication’s available, pertinent metadata and return the information to the author for approval prior to final submission.

• Is OA a scheme to move the burden of subscription costs on to Faculty? No. Open Access is an effort to make research publications as widely available as possible. To do so, we must shift from the standard subscription-based model (i.e., payment for access) to a model that supports the publication of freely accessible research through contributions from funders, institutions, and/or authors. Currently, University libraries pay for ever-increasing subscriptions to journals, and so the burden of costs already fall on Faculty in the form of reduced library services, access, and staff.

• I’ve never paid to publish before, why should I do so now? Authors have historically paid for reprints, page charges, color plates, etc. In some cases these would have been more expensive than current OA publication fees. For conferences, authors routinely pay submission fees for abstracts or to print posters. Authors also pay for reagents, materials, and other parts of a publication (e.g., statistics, sequencing, or illustrations). Paying for someone to publish your paper can be seen as just another contracted service in support of your research.

• Will NIH pay for publication costs? Yes. According to published NIH policy, “The NIH will reimburse publication costs, including author fees, for grants and contracts on three conditions: (1) such costs incurred are actual, allowable, and reasonable to advance the objectives of the award; (2) costs are charged consistently regardless of the source of support; (3) all other applicable rules on allowability of costs are met.”

• Will my Institution help pay for publication costs? Yes. In lieu of subscription costs, the library will have resources available to support Faculty publications in Open Access journals.

• Are OA journals peer-reviewed to the same degree as more traditional publications? Yes. A journal’s economic or access policy does not determine its peer review policy. Most scholarly journals, whether open access or controlled-access journals, are rigorously peer-reviewed, and usually by Faculty just like us. There are both open and controlled journals that are not peer-reviewed. Many publishers now have an open access option for individual articles. This open access option does not change the quality of the peer review or editorial process for those journals or articles.

• There are a lot of bad open access journals out there, how do we distinguish the good journals from the bad ones? Open access is not a designation of quality. OA journals should be judged by exactly the same criteria as any traditional publication: the caliber of the research published, the peer review process, the composition of the editorial board and staff, impact factors or any other trusted metrics of quality.
• Do articles published in OA journals get as much credit during T&P reviews as articles published in commercial journals? Would there be a disproportionate impact on junior Faculty who have not yet been tenured? The proposed policy should have no effect on tenure and promotion. The policy does not prescribe or proscribe the venues in which an author may publish. It could have a positive effect on some scholarship insofar as leading to more visibility and higher rates of citation.
UCSF OPEN ACCESS POLICY

Rich Schneider, Chair
UCSF Academic Senate Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication (COLASC)
UCSF OPEN ACCESS POLICY

① Costs of the current “closed” system of scholarly publishing: actual, societal, and scientific.

② Open Access: an alignment of our academic principles, intellectual rights, and our public mission.

③ An Open Access Policy for UCSF.

④ Frequently asked questions.
Life Cycle of a Scholarly Article

1. Readers
   - Find and read articles
   - Think of new research questions

2. Researchers/Academics
   - Study earlier research (literature review)
   - Conduct original research
   - Analyse results and draw conclusions
   - Write research paper

3. Researchers/Academics
   - Review and edit articles
   - Accept or reject articles for publication

4. Bibliographic Services
   - Article indexes (databases)
   - Facilitate discovery of articles
   - Libraries provide subscription access and help

5. Academic Publishers
   - Prepare articles for publication in scholarly journals

Costly

Variable Costs

Free
Percent Increase in Cost for the Average Health Sciences Journal versus the CPI
Library Expenditure as % of Total University Expenditure
(Average of 40 US Institutions Reporting Since 1982)
2011 UC Systemwide eContent Expenditures

- Total
  - $38,743,006
- CDL
  - $6,261,137
  - 16%
- 10 Campuses
  - $32,481,869
  - 84%
- UCSF
  - $1,628,152
  - 4% of total
Faculty are losing access to content

• 9 database contracts cancelled since 2008.

• 600 journals (7.5%) cancelled in 2010-2011, including one entire contract.

• More journal cancellations in 2013.
## 2010/2011 Profits for Commercial Publishers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Profits</th>
<th>Revenues</th>
<th>Profit Margin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elsevier</td>
<td>$1.2B</td>
<td>$2B</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wiley</td>
<td>$106M</td>
<td>$253M</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springer</td>
<td>$467M</td>
<td>$1.4B</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informa</td>
<td>$74M</td>
<td>$230M</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Apple** 24%
- **Google** 27%
UC authors add significant value to commercial journals *pro bono*

- **Key Principle**: For-profit journals rely upon the contributions of content and labor by Universities:
  - Authorship – Editorship
  - Peer review – Advisory board service

- **Examples**: UC authorship contribution to Elsevier journals
  - UC authors: 2.2% of all Elsevier articles
  - UC author estimated contribution to Elsevier revenue: $31M
  - UC author estimated contribution to Elsevier profit: $9.8M

  - UC authors: 12% of all published articles in *Nature*
  - UC author estimated contribution to *Nature* revenue: $5M
  - UC author estimated contribution to *Nature* profit: $700K
Value of Peer Review

• “The typical reviewer spends 5 hours per review and reviews some 8 articles a year.”
  - The STM Report, 2009

• Value of UC peer review, all publishers: $21 million
  – Conservative figure, based on Senate Faculty only
In 2002, the Budapest Open Access Initiative defined open access as:

"the world-wide electronic distribution of the peer-reviewed journal literature, completely free and unrestricted access to it by all scientists, scholars, teachers, students, and other curious minds."
In 2003, a meeting of the biomedical community released the Bethesda Statement on Open Access Publishing:

"An Open Access Publication is one that meets the following two conditions:

1. The author(s) and copyright holder(s) grant(s) to all users a free, irrevocable, worldwide, perpetual right of access to, and a license to copy, use, distribute, transmit and display the work publicly and to make and distribute derivative works, in any digital medium for any responsible purpose, subject to proper attribution of authorship, as well as the right to make small numbers of printed copies for their personal use.

2. A complete version of the work and all supplemental materials, including a copy of the permission as stated above, in a suitable standard electronic format is deposited immediately upon initial publication in at least one online repository that is supported by an academic institution, scholarly society, government agency, or other well-established organization that seeks to enable open access, unrestricted distribution, interoperability, and long-term archiving (PubMed Central is such a repository)."
Benefits of Open Access for Faculty and Society

• Increases visibility, usage, and impact of research.

• Fuels innovation, discovery, and progress.

• Allows Faculty to retain control over their publications.

• Allows Faculty to use derivatives of their own work freely.

• The Public gets a return on its investment (i.e., results of funded research is freely accessible and not behind costly barriers).

• Promotes knowledge and free expression as a public good.

• Supports our mission of teaching and learning.

• Offers potential savings for libraries and Institutions.

• Creates free market forces and competition for publishers.
Strategies to Achieve Open Access

• Funder mandates for OA repositories
• Institutional mandates for OA repositories
• Society-sponsored open access journals
• Fee-based open access journals
• Fee-based open access articles
Public Access to UCSF Author Articles

Percentage of 3,500 articles published in 2010 that are in PubMed Central
Major US Institutions with OA Mandates

As of April 2012 there are 141 institutional mandates worldwide:

- **Harvard** – February 2008
- **Stanford University** – June 2008
- **MIT** – March 2009
- **Kansas University** – November 2009
- **Duke** – March 2010
- **Emory** – June 2011
- **Princeton** – September 2011

UC made its first attempt at a Systemwide OA Policy in 2006 (upon which many of the above were subsequently based)
Concerns/Myths about Open Access

• Effect on academic and professional societies
• Peer review process
• Vanity publishing
• Sustainability
Using the PLoS average article processing fee of $1,649 U.S. per article, or BMC average article processing charge of $1,560 U.S., libraries worldwide could fund full open access to the world's estimated 1.5 million scholarly peer-reviewed journal articles produced every year at less than 30% of current annual global academic library journal expenditures.

Faculty retain copyright

A UC Open Access Policy would encourage scholarly publishers to change their expectations about who should retain which rights in a publication.

The Current UC Policy on Copyright Ownership (August 19, 1992) already establishes that UC Faculty hold the copyright for their scholarly work.

Yet, Faculty routinely give up their copyrights completely to commercial publishers who then manage these rights for profit.

Under an Open Access Policy, scholars would grant to the University a specific non-exclusive right to disseminate their work, rather than granting publishers exclusive control over a publication.
UCSF Open Access Policy

The Faculty of The University of California at San Francisco (UCSF) is committed to disseminating its research and scholarship as widely as possible, and as members of a public university system, is dedicated specifically to making its scholarship available to the people of California. Thus, the Faculty adopts the following policy:

For the purpose of open dissemination, each Faculty member grants to The Regents of the University of California, a nonexclusive, irrevocable, worldwide license to exercise any and all rights under copyright relating to each of his or her scholarly articles, in any medium, provided that the articles are not sold, and to authorize others to do the same. The policy applies to all scholarly articles authored or co-authored while the person is a member of the Faculty except for any articles completed before the adoption of this policy and any articles for which the Faculty member entered into an incompatible licensing or assignment agreement before the adoption of this policy. This policy does not transfer copyright ownership, which remains with Faculty authors under existing University of California policy. Application of the license will be waived for a particular article or access delayed for a specified period of time upon express direction by a Faculty member to the University of California.

To assist the University in disseminating scholarly articles, each Faculty member will provide an electronic copy of his or her final version of the article to the University of California by the date of publication. The University of California will make the article available in an open-access repository. When appropriate, a Faculty member may instead notify the University of California if the article will be freely available in another repository or as an open-access publication.

The Academic Senate and the University of California will be responsible for implementing this policy, resolving disputes concerning its interpretation and application, and recommending any changes to the Faculty. The Academic Senate and the University of California will review the policy within three years, and present a report to the Faculty.

The Faculty calls upon the Academic Senate and the University of California to develop and monitor a service or mechanism that would render implementation and compliance with the policy as convenient for the Faculty as possible.
UCSF Division Meeting

Monday, May 21st 2012
12:00 - 2:00 pm
HSW-300 at Parnassus
Rock Hall at Mission Bay

Please come and vote!
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FAQs

• Why are we doing this? A UCSF Open Access Policy would be a powerful, collective statement about the Faculty commitment to promote the access to and use of our scholarship by the wider public. The primary aim is to make our scholarship more widely available and accessible. We would assert Faculty control over the publication of scholarly research, and recognize our responsibility for making that process sustainable and true to the intentions of scholars. We would also be sending a strong collective message to commercial publishers about our values and the system we would like to see put in place.

• Why does the policy use an automatic license? Why not just let individuals do it themselves? Experience has shown that mere exhortations have little effect on authors’ behavior. Before Congress made it a requirement, participation in the NIH Public Access Policy was optional. During that period, there was only a 4% level of compliance. Opt-out systems achieve much higher degrees of participation than opt-in systems, even while remaining non-coercive. By making a blanket policy, individual Faculty benefit from their membership in the policy-making group. The University can work with publishers on behalf of the Faculty to simplify procedures and broaden access. Without a blanket policy, the unified action benefit of the policy would be vitiated.

• What must Faculty do to comply with this policy? The policy operates automatically to give UC a license to make available all scholarly articles. This policy can be communicated to your publisher when signing the copyright license or assignment agreement in the form of a boilerplate addendum, and simply notifies the publisher that any agreement is subject to this prior license. Part of the implementation plan will be to provide a standard addendum for this purpose.
FAQs

• Is OA a scheme to move the burden of subscription costs on to Faculty? No. Open Access is an effort to make research publications as widely available as possible. To do so, we must shift from the standard subscription-based model (i.e., payment for access) to a model that supports the publication of freely accessible research through contributions from funders, institutions, and/or authors. Currently, University libraries pay for ever-increasing subscriptions to journals, and so the burden of costs already fall on Faculty in the form of reduced library services, access, and staff.

• I’ve never paid to publish before, why should I do so now? Authors have historically paid for reprints, page charges, color plates, etc. In some cases these would have been more expensive then current OA publication fees. For conferences, authors routinely pay submission fees for abstracts or to print posters. Authors also pay for reagents, materials, and other parts of a publication (e.g., statistics, sequencing, or illustrations). Paying for someone to publish your paper can be seen as just another contracted service in support of your research.

• Will NIH pay for publication costs? Yes. According to published NIH policy, “The NIH will reimburse publication costs, including author fees, for grants and contracts on three conditions: (1) such costs incurred are actual, allowable, and reasonable to advance the objectives of the award; (2) costs are charged consistently regardless of the source of support; (3) all other applicable rules on allowability of costs are met.”

• Will my Institution help pay for publication costs? Yes. In lieu of subscription costs, the library will have resources available to support Faculty publications in Open Access journals.
FAQs

• Are OA journals peer-reviewed to the same degree as more traditional publications? Yes. A journal’s economic or access policy does not determine its peer review policy. Most scholarly journals, whether open access or controlled-access journals, are rigorously peer-reviewed, and usually by Faculty just like us. There are both open and controlled journals that are not peer-reviewed. Many publishers now have an open access option for individual articles. This open access option does not change the quality of the peer review or editorial process for those journals or articles.

• There are a lot of bad open access journals out there, how do we distinguish the good journals from the bad ones? Open access is not a designation of quality. OA journals should be judged by exactly the same criteria as any traditional publication: the caliber of the research published, the peer review process, the composition of the editorial board and staff, impact factors or any other trusted metrics of quality.

• Do articles published in OA journals get as much credit during T&P reviews as articles published in commercial journals? Would there be a disproportionate impact on junior Faculty who have not yet been tenured? The proposed policy should have no effect on tenure and promotion. The policy does not prescribe or proscribe the venues in which an author may publish. It could have a positive effect on some scholarship insofar as leading to more visibility and higher rates of citation.
FAQs

• **What effect will this have on the ability of Faculty to publish in top-ranked journals?** None. The policy is completely agnostic with respect to where a Faculty member chooses to publish: it only requires that Faculty retain the right to make the work available in a repository. If a publisher refuses to publish a work due to the policy, the Faculty member has several options: he or she can choose to publish elsewhere, ask your UL or CDL to negotiate with the publisher, or in the last instance, simply opt out of the application of the license.

• **Can I opt out of this policy?** Yes. The policy allows Faculty members to opt out of making a work open access. If for any reason, the scholar does not want the work to be made publicly available, he or she simply needs to inform UC. The policy does not, however, allow Faculty to opt out of the deposit requirement. We are in essence, agreeing to make a copy of our articles either actually or potentially available freely in a repository.

• **Doesn’t this opt-out approach mean that the policy has no teeth? Won’t publishers just demand that all authors opt out?** Many publishers already allow deposit of articles in their standard agreements, and will have no issue with this policy. A goal of this policy is not to make large publishers capitulate to Faculty demands for open access, but to find ways to make our work have greater impact and accessibility. If there is any message to publishers, it is that we hope they will continue to explore options for more sustainable open access publishing solutions in the future, so that policies such as this one become unnecessary.
FAQs

• **Why require Faculty to deposit an article even if they opt out of the Open Access requirement?** There are at least three possible advantages: 1) it allows the Faculty member to change their mind later; 2) it allows an independent entity (UC/CDL) to preserve a copy of any publication in the case that a publisher goes out of business or decides to sell or close a particular journal or venue; and 3) it retains for the Faculty member the right to republish an article in another venue in the case that a publisher refuses permission. An unintended effect might be the creation of a robust archive of UC Faculty publications for the purposes of review for promotion and tenure.

• **Would a UC Open Access policy increase Faculty vulnerability to piracy of our intellectual property? Will it enable plagiarism?** The policy creates an open access version of a scholarly article covered by copyright. All of the rights and duties that exist in the case of traditional publication remain in the case of the Open Access version, including the ability to prosecute in cases of piracy or plagiarism. If anything, it will deter piracy by allowing access to a freely available version of an article that might otherwise be distributed unlawfully. Plagiarism is something that cannot be addressed by an open access policy.

• **What version will I submit to the repository?** The policy requires that the author submit the “author’s final version”—which usually means the manuscript copy post-peer review but before a publisher typesets and finalizes it. In the case that the author is publishing in an open access journal, the version submitted might be the final published version.
FAQs

• Publishers usually require Faculty to check a box indicating transfer of copyright before a paper is published. Would Faculty be in compliance with the policy if they checked the box? Faculty will be free to transfer their copyright to whomever they wish, but articles would henceforth be subject to a pre-existing license. In practice, Faculty may opt out of the Open Access requirement, meaning that the policy requires only that a copy of the pre-publication version of an article be deposited with UC, though not made available. Publishers should be alerted to the policy using a standard addendum. Faculty might also want to think carefully about transferring copyright to any publisher, and instead offer a license. Many Faculty routinely modify their agreements to do just that, and many publishers comply.

• What do Faculty need to do to comply with the policy? Not much. Simply notify the publisher of the policy when signing the final publishing agreement and deposit a copy of the article, upon publication, within UC’s eScholarship open access repository. UC’s eScholarship repository already houses over 7,000 postprints within its more than 45,000 UC-affiliated publications. If your articles are already deposited in PubMed Central per NIH policy, then you will continue to deposit there with the understanding that a copy will also be harvested and deposited in eScholarship, unless you opt out of this policy altogether. The eScholarship submission process will be quite minimal and involve a simple web form. The UL’s and CDL’s technical teams intend to refine this process further by developing a system that, upon receipt of a document, will harvest all of that publication’s available, pertinent metadata and return the information to the author for approval prior to final submission.
Request A Waiver

To request a waiver of Harvard's Open Access Policy, simply use the Waiver Generator and supply the information requested there. A formal letter notifying you of the waiver of the policy will be emailed to you at the address you provide.

Even if you are required by a publisher to waive the policy as a condition of publication, chances are you can still make your article publicly available in the Harvard repository, as explained further below. Thus, whether your article is under a waiver or not, you should still deposit the final manuscript in DASH.

The repository accepts not only articles covered by the license granted to Harvard under the Open Access Policy, but also articles not covered by the license.

Even if you take a waiver, the publisher’s agreement may provide, or you may be able to negotiate, sufficient rights to allow copies of your article to be made publicly available in the Harvard repository. The publisher may ask that certain conditions be met, some of which the repository can accommodate (for example, an embargo period during which the article will not be made publicly available).

Information about publishers’ standard policies on open access is available from the SHERPA/RoMEO project (though Harvard has not verified the accuracy of that information).

Further, even if your article cannot be made publicly available, you are encouraged to deposit a copy in the repository under the "metadata only" option, which stores a copy in the repository for archival purposes and provides bibliographic information that can be included in an online index of scholarly articles by Harvard members.

The bibliographic information will be made available for broad harvesting and indexing by search engines, in order to increase awareness of your article. This will enable your article more readily to be found, even if a copy cannot be made available to others through the repository.
Amend a Publishing Agreement

To avoid a conflicting transfer of copyright to the publisher and to protect yourself from breach of contract, you can use the addendum generator to prepare an “author addendum” to attach to the agreement with a publisher. Even without the attachment of an addendum, however, the license to Harvard will still have force unless it is waived for a particular article.

Each school’s open access policy operates automatically to give the University a nonexclusive license in any scholarly articles a faculty member completes after its adoption. This is true for both existing and later-hired faculty members.

Publishers’ agreements concerning publication of articles often contain provisions that are inconsistent with the prior license granted to Harvard under the Open Access Policy.

For instance, a publisher’s agreement may specify that you transfer all copyright in the article to the publisher and that you warrant that there are no prior licenses. The existence of the prior license to Harvard means that this warranty is not true. If you sign the publication agreement without an appropriate amendment, you may be in breach of the agreement.

Frequently Asked Questions

What is an author addendum?

An author addendum is a simple legal tool. The typical addendum is a short document, used to amend the agreement issued by a publisher. You have the option to use an appropriate addendum with a publisher’s agreement, so that the agreement will take proper account of Harvard’s license, unless you are sure that the publisher’s agreement is wholly consistent with Harvard’s license.

Though other forms of addendum are available, Harvard has developed an addendum specifically designed to deal with the prior license granted to the University. It also enables you to reserve or obtain some additional rights if you wish. Instructions for using the Harvard addendum are provided with the addendum generator on this web site.