

February 20, 2018

**TO:** Steven Mandeville-Gamble, University Librarian

FROM: Dylan Rodriguez, Chair, Riverside Division

**SUBJECT:** Open Access 2020 (OA2020) Initiative

Dear Steve:

I am pleased to forward the full set of Senate committee responses on the OA2020 Proposal.

Peace.

dylan



November 6, 2017

To: Dylan Rodríguez, Chair

**Riverside Division** 

From: Tim Paine, Chair

Committee on Educational Policy

Re: Expression of Interest for Open Access 2020

The Committee on Educational Policy reviewed the Expression of Interest for Open Access 2020 at their November 3, 2017 meeting and voted to broadly support the motion to sign the expression of interest in principle, but did note significant concern with issues regarding cost assessment and copyright.



December 14, 2017

To: Dylan Rodriguez, Chair

Riverside Division of the Academic Senate

From: John Levin, Chair

Committee on Academic Freedom

Re: Open Access 2020 Proposal

The Committee on Academic Freedom considered the Open Access 2020 Proposal and is in favor of UCR signing the Expression of Interest in order to participate in the discussions regarding this movement. However, the committee stresses that any potential implementation process should ensure that academic freedom is protected and that discrimination is avoided. For instance, faculty should not be compelled to make a choice of where to publish based on the cost to publish in the journal rather than the quality of the journal.



November 15, 2017

To: Dylan Rodriguez

Riverside Division Academic Senate

From: Vyjayanthi Chari, Chair

Committee on Academic Personnel

Re: Open Access 2020 Proposal (OA2020)

The Committee on Academic Personnel met to consider the Open Access 2020 Proposal. CAP is in favor of UCR signing the Expression of Interest for Open Access 2020.

CAP is concerned that open access journals often do not have metrics such as impact factors. CAP feels that it is therefore very important that departments and deans are supportive of faculty publishing in such journals and that appropriate metrics be developed to evaluate such venues as opposed to the more established journals.



November 17, 2017

To: Dylan Rodriguez, Chair

**Riverside Division** 

From: Amit Roy-Chowdhury, Chair

Committee on Research

RE: Campus Review: [Proposal] Open Access 2020 (OA2020)

The Committee on Research reviewed the Open access 2020 proposal. The committee was overall supportive of the proposal but there was a concern that it could become an extra expense for faculty grants and suggests a more concrete statement be added to ensure it does not happen.



November 14, 2017

To: Dylan Rodríguez, Chair

**Riverside Division** 

From: Wee Liang Gan, Chair

Committee on Courses

Re: Open Access 2020

The Committee on Courses reviewed the Open Access 2020 Expression of Interest and were supportive of the document. The Committee noted that an Expression of Interest seems a reasonable step for the campus to undertake even though the details and implications of Open Access have yet to be worked out. The Committee recommends that the System proceed with considerable caution with the implementation of Open Access.



November 15, 2017

To: Dylan Rodriguez

Riverside Division Academic Senate

From: Daniel Jeske, Chair

Committee on Faculty Welfare

Re: Open Access 2020 Proposal (OA2020)

The UCR Faculty Welfare Committee (FWC) considered the proposal for UCR to sign the Expression of Interest (EoI) for the Open Access 2020 (OA2020) initiative. We interpret from the accompanying cover letter from Leonard Nunney that signature of the EoI would mean that UCR is expressing 'broad support' for the initiative. For reasons discussed below, FWC falls short of expressing 'broad support' for the initiative. However, during the formative stage of detailing how OA2020 might work, we do feel it is important for UCR to have a seat at the table. We therefore offer qualified support for signing the EoI. Our reasons for qualified support of the EoI include:

- 1. Concern with the specific details of how the cost of publishing will be worked out. FWC speculates that these costs, or at least some portion of them, will be passed on to the authors and finds this prospect concerning.
- 2. It was noted in our discussion that currently there is tremendous variability in the cost of publishing in open access journals, ranging from zero dollars to thousands of dollars. Would a proposed subsidy plan for publishing in open access journals result in faculty choosing journals they 'could afford' to publish in rather than choosing based upon where the work would have the biggest impact?
- 3. We discussed a concern that widespread open access publishing framework might adversely impact professional societies who rely on journal subscription revenues to function. A likely consequence might be higher membership fees imposed upon faculty members.
- 4. Finally, FWC noted that quality of open access journals varies considerably. A naive, yet real, view held by some members of academia is that they are 'pay to publish' venues. FWC notes the challenge of overcoming this bias. Especially while both the open access and traditional publishing models co-exist, merit and promotion processes will need to consciously work toward eliminating stereotypes concerning the choice of publishing outlets, and truly focus on the quality of the research in the paper.



## **Graduate Council**

November 16, 2017

Dylan Rodriguez, Chair To:

Riverside Division

From: Christiane Weirauch, Chair

**Graduate Council** 

Open Access 2020 Re:

The Graduate Council reviewed the Open Access 2020 proposal at their November 16, 2017 meeting. The committee had no concerns and approved the proposal.



## PLANNING & BUDGET

November 14, 2017

To: Dylan Rodriguez, Chair

Riverside Division

From: Christian Shelton, Chair Chair Chair

Committee on Planning and Budget

**RE:** Open Access 2020 Proposal

Planning & Budget (P&B) is in support of the principle of Open Access and feels that it has the potential to alleviate cost burdens currently born by Universities. P&B also feels it is important that UCR is part of discussions to make this happen.

This document does not make clear what open access principles are being proposed or what the goals of the proposal are. Nor does it take into account transition costs. There are not enough details on the cost considerations, how they would be funded, or a discussion of what the relevant questions are at this stage. Discipline specific differences are ignored in the proposal but are important to framing solutions. Future impacts on publishing and current sectors are not discussed.



November 14, 2017

To: Dylan Rodríguez, Chair

**Riverside Division** 

From: James Brennan, Chair Juni Branch

Committee on University Extension

Re: Open Access 2020

The Committee on University Extension reviewed the Open Access 2020 proposal and did not note any concerns regarding the Committee's purview of University Extension. However, as the Committee does not speak on behalf of University Extension, the Committee recommends that this proposal also be reviewed by the Dean of University Extension.

## UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, RIVERSIDE

BERKELEY • DAVIS • IRVINE • LOS ANGELES • MERCED • RIVERSIDE • SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO



EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE: COLLEGE OF HUMANITIES, ARTS, AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

RIVERSIDE, CALIFORNIA 92521-0132

December 07, 2017

TO: Dylan Rodriguez, Chair

Academic Senate

FROM: Kate Sweeny, Chair

**CHASS Executive Committee** 

RE: Proposal Open Access 2020

The CHASS Executive Committee discussed the Proposal Open Access 2020 at the regular meeting on November 29, 2017. The committee is supportive of open access in spirit. However, the committee also expressed significant concerns about the practicalities involved in achieving this goal.

Kate Sweeny, Chair

**CHASS Executive Committee** 



December 14, 2017

To: Dylan Rodriguez, Chair

Riverside Division

From: Ward Beyermann, Chair, Executive Committee

College of Natural and Agricultural Science

Re: Campus Review: Open Access 2020

The committee discussed this at its November 14, 2017 meeting. The committee members shared their knowledge on Open Access and expressed concerns particularly on the financial implications of its implementation. Regarding this particular document, we felt it was vague and unclear. More information, especially on the financial viability is needed before we can accurately assess the merits of this proposal.

Yours sincerely,

Ward Beyermann, Chair

Ward Beyerm

**CNAS Executive Committee**