

## Summary of Votes and Comments Received on UF Open Access Policy Drafts

### **College of Business**

*Votes:* Unknown

*Comments:*

- Belief that faculty cannot bind publishers to accept the policy; misunderstanding that policy applies to work already published and copyright transferred

### **College of Journalism and Communications**

*Votes:* Research Committee unanimously voted against the proposal; faculty vote is unknown

*Comments:*

- Three main journals in advertising would not accept this plan; I suspect that would be the same in other disciplines.
- Suggests that opt-out programs are more productive than opt-in systems. Research suggests that people do not read the details, much like warning labels and informed consent forms, so the yield is much greater. I don't think this is a good strategy with that in mind.
- Does not address co-authorship when they are at different universities that may not participate in this program. This might unduly influence choice of co-authors
- Not feasible for untenured faculty or those going up for full.
- The fees that could be potentially assessed to authors (some quite high--can be thousands of dollars), as well as potential "quality" ramifications, both as these pertain to journal reputation and prestige, as well as the quality of research getting submitted to such journals or how submission quality and reviews would be affected as a result.
- We understand that libraries are strapped for cash, and are seeking ways to provide access without the high institutional subscription fees. But someone still must pay the costs, and this could fall into authors' laps. We do not believe that faculty should be forced to bear the high cost of publishing their own work.

### **College of Pharmacy**

*Votes:* No vote taken; only comments solicited

*Comments:*

- Policy is viewed as too proscriptive
- Misunderstanding that policy is mandate to publish in open access journals
- Concern over who will pay open access fees now that UFOAP is gone
- Policy viewed as burden on faculty – "busy work"
- Policy viewed as wasting faculty time and lowering their productivity
- Confusion about why there are two policy drafts and the relationship of one to the other
- Belief that University should negotiate with publishers rather than putting burden on faculty to secure their rights

## **IFAS**

**Votes:** Mandatory Policy – 19 in favor, 19 opposed, 22 neutral

Voluntary Policy – 28 in favor, 18 opposed, 14 neutral

### **Comments:**

- Burden on faculty – whether completing Notice of Publication or uploading documents to the IR
- Confusion and concern about irrevocable nature of pre-existing license in mandatory policy
- Misunderstanding that policy mandates publication in open access journals rather than retention of rights to permit deposit of manuscript in open access repository
- Unclear how policy would apply in multi-author situation
- Concern that open access policy being pushed when open access policy fund has been discontinued
- Belief that University should negotiate with publishers rather than putting burden on faculty to secure their rights
- Confusion about why there are two policy drafts and the relationship of one to the other
- Fear that IR will become populated with “bad science” as result of policy
- Suggestion that policy include an allowed embargo

## **George A. Smathers Libraries**

**Votes:** 16 in favor of mandatory policy; 15 in favor of voluntary policy

### **Comments:**

- Unclear how policy would apply in multi-author scenario
- Policy viewed as good leverage in negotiation with publishers
- Open access policy viewed as part of being a preeminent university
- Concern that open access policy being pushed when open access policy fund has been discontinued
- Concern that open access journals do not have same impact as other publications (this implies misunderstanding that policy mandates publication in only open access journals)
- Belief that policy will not be complied with unless mandatory
- Policy is recognition of many benefits of open access
- Policy will breed further distrust of open access
- Suggestion that policy be adopted college by college rather than by whole institution