

KU Open Access Policy: Raw Results of Survey of KU faculty

1. How many years have you been on the faculty at KU?			Response Percent	Response Count
1-3 years			11.4%	18
3-5 years			13.3%	21
5-10 years			21.5%	34
10+ years			53.8%	85
			<i>answered question</i>	158
			<i>skipped question</i>	2

2. What is your tenure status at KU?			Response Percent	Response Count
Non-tenure track			10.8%	17
Tenure track but not yet tenured			17.8%	28
Tenured			71.3%	112
			<i>answered question</i>	157
			<i>skipped question</i>	3

3. In what department/school is your primary appointment? (note that these responses are provided as respondents provided them, and so some entities may appear multiple times under different versions of their names)	Number of respondents
Aerospace Engineering	1
American Studies	1
Anthropology	2
Applied Behavioral Science	1
Architecture & Urban Planning	1
Art History	1
Business	3
Center for Research on Learning/SPED	1
Chemical and Petroleum Engineering	1
Chemistry	2
Civil, Environmental and Architectural Engineering	1
CLAS	12

Classics	11
Curriculum & Teaching	2
Ecology & Evolutionary Biology	13
Education	4
EECS	2
Engineering	2
English	7
English/LAS	1
Environmental Studies	1
Fine Arts	1
French and Italian	2
Geography	1
Geology	4
Germanic Languages and Literatures	1
GINS	1
Graduate Program in Urban Planning	1
Health, Sport, and Exercise Sciences	1
History	5
history of art	1
HWC	1
Institute for Life-Span Studies and Dept of Special Ed.	1
Journalism	1
Kansas Geological Survey	3
KU Libraries	16
Linguistics	2
Math	3
Mechanical Engineering	1
Molecular Bioscience/CLAS	4
Music & Dance	3
Pharmaceutical Chemistry	1
Pharmacology	2
Pharmacy	3
Philosophy	2
Physics	2
Physics and Astronomy	4
Political Science	4
Psychology	4
Psychology and Research in Education	2
religious studies	1
school of business	3
School of Education	1
School of Social Welfare	3
Slavic	1
Sociology	3
Spanish and Portuguese	1
Special Education	1
Theatre and Film	2
Urban Planning	1

4. Please provide your ideas regarding various potential benefits of an open access policy:						
	Not important	Somewhat important	Neutral	Important	Very important	Response Count
Preserve the research of KU scholars in a central place, such as KU ScholarWorks	15.8% (23)	7.5% (11)	27.4% (40)	28.8% (42)	20.5% (30)	146
Make preprint versions, (i.e. first drafts prior to peer review sent to publishers) of my research freely available to a worldwide audience	50.0% (73)	8.9% (13)	18.5% (27)	15.8% (23)	6.8% (10)	146
Make my research available before the traditional publication	37.7% (55)	15.8% (23)	25.3% (37)	15.1% (22)	6.2% (9)	146
Make my research available online without my having to maintain a website of my own	15.9% (23)	9.7% (14)	17.2% (25)	32.4% (47)	24.8% (36)	145
Provide long-term preservation of my digital research materials (e.g., data, images, drafts)	17.0% (25)	8.2% (12)	10.9% (16)	34.0% (50)	29.9% (44)	147
Make it easier for other people to search for and locate my work	8.2% (12)	6.1% (9)	8.2% (12)	38.1% (56)	39.5% (58)	147
Make access to my work to scholars in other countries more convenient	11.0% (16)	7.5% (11)	11.0% (16)	34.2% (50)	36.3% (53)	146

5. Please provide any additional comments that you might have regarding potential benefits of open access to scholarship
... 120 respondents offered no additional comments ...
1) Most journals and books are now available digitally, so doing this on the scale of individual universities does not seem necessary, in my discipline at least (literary studies). 2) Preprint and draft materials are not for the public!
A data archive should follow best practices for long term preservation of the metadata along with the data.
As a faculty member, I support open access in general, but as the editor of a journal, I have reservations about allowing open access to recent issues. In a time of declining subscription numbers, KU journals may need to charge (modestly) for recent publications in order to remain solvent.
As an active, publishing scholar in the humanities, I do not think "open access" benefits me in any way, and I would not want to share my work in any of the ways outlined above.
Benefits must be weighed against disadvantages. Endorsing benefits might be interpreted as endorsing the form of open access being discussed on KU campus. At this point, I will do everything possible to comply with NIH open access. I hope policies at KU will not add to my burden.
Having easy access to the work of others
I am unsure about the wisdom of publishing work in this way that has not yet been accepted by a journal or academic book publisher.
I cannot access the Harvard link. The concerns I have with this is that in the areas of Indigenous Nations Studies and American Indian History (at least) a review process prior to publication is crucial. In the past few years there have been many inferior works published by journals and presses without a peer review process and this is the kind of "publicity" these authors would like. Also there is non-

<p>reviewed work out there by non-Indians who claim to be Indians. If KU faculty "research" is to be made available w/o such a process, then KU should make certain it does not endorse that work. Any important work done by KU faculty is already "out there" and other scholars usually know where to find it. Personally, I would not want my work "pre-published" without peer review. Peer review is a protective device. There also is the real possibility of plagiarism of work not in published form.</p>
<p>I have become very concerned about the commercialization of scholarly communication. That is, scholarly communication has become "big business," which in turn costs scholars worldwide huge amounts of money to access knowledge. The international aspect of these open access initiatives is perhaps the most important dimension of the issue: try going to a developing country and doing your usual research efforts, and you will understand!</p>
<p>I have most of this already through other means so this particular initiative doesn't impact me from these questions that you have on this survey.</p>
<p>I like to wait until research has gone through a tough review process and has been accepted for publication.</p>
<p>I put 'Not important' for each of these because I find it easier to maintain my own web site, with my research posted there, than I imagine I would find it to work with another unit at KU maintaining a separate repository of my research.</p>
<p>I worry about copyright issues.</p>
<p>i'd funded by the nih - not clear to me what a ku-specific OA policy offers me over the nih policy</p>
<p>If KU fully gets behind this movement, it will enhance the reputation of KU in the scholarly community as well as among citizens of the state.</p>
<p>If this is an electronic equivalent of a library, that is nice. If it is more, such as being able to maintain databases into the future, that would be fantastic!</p>
<p>I'm already doing all of this on my own web sites, but having something that is backed up would be nice</p>
<p>In engineering, a critical issue related to Open Access is control of IP. In my view, any system which limits the ability of the University to use research results for profit (rather than for scholarship) is helpful. Many of the KU IP lawyers actively prevent publication of novel ideas, in the hope that such ideas will eventually lead to patents and licensing for the good of the University. If Open Access can help the faculty's attempts to publish, then it will be a useful system.</p>
<p>In my field (physical sciences) the current state of the art in electronic publication already provides all of the potential benefits listed here. Based on these statements, there appears to be no benefit to me for open access.</p>
<p>In question #4, the definition of "research" is not clear. The term could mean anything from published work all the way down to raw data. I support archiving published work and making it public. I strongly oppose making data and manuscripts available that have not been peer reviewed.</p>
<p>It would make my current projects known while in progress, but this is not so crucial in my branch of the humanities as, say, in the sciences. Hence what may seem to be inconsistency in my responses. In other words, I do not by any means oppose the initiative, but see it less liable to affect my own work.</p>
<p>Just not useful in my field. Materials uploaded in this way seem bogus.</p>
<p>make my research available after peer review but prior to publication--as that can take so long</p>
<p>mandatory nature of draft policy is offensive and illegal</p>
<p>most faculty at KU have not actually been made aware of this issue, so this survey is premature.....</p>
<p>my research is in performance so the above does not really apply</p>
<p>My stuff is widely read anyway. And there is JSTOR. So, as a matter of self-interest, what's the point. There is already too much stuff in the journals to read.</p>
<p>Normal publications in the chemical literature make my work readily available to all interested parties. In addition, the profession maintains exceptionally good literature search capabilities to facilitate that availability. With regard to casual publications, as opposed to refereed publications, I see value mainly in secondary rather than primary literature for that purpose. Also, in highly technical fields, publications are often also related to patents and those relationships greatly complicate the publication</p>

process.
Open access to KU scholarship will demonstrate the value of research conducted by faculty to funders, will increase researcher visibility, and will lower access barriers for persons not affiliated with well-funded institutions.
prepublication availability of original research is preposterous, I would never agree to do this
Some journals offer "Open-Access" for a fee when you publish. Funds from the university made available to pay this fee, would help more researchers take advantage of this option.
Speaking from experience and expertise in preservation, the long-term preservation of digital content requires new understandings and serious, formal, university commitment to provide the support, ongoing costs and resources required for digital preservation program development and maintenance.
The initiative could be counterproductive: journals might not want to consider research that is already available online; or scholarly journal might not grant permission to make the article available in other formats.
The more you give the more you receive
The reason for my neutral responses is that in mathematics we have a well-established digital preprint archive and people will look either on my website or on this math archive for my work, not on a central site at KU.
There is only a benefit to me if doing so does not require more work on my end to make the articles accessible - if we as authors have to be the middle men between open access and the journal editors and publishers - the hassle for me is not worth it.
This is an unnecessary expense and will be an excuse to increase the amount of funding diverted to incompetent library employees.
This makes sense for already-published work. It should not apply to materials that have not undergone peer review.
While might be addressed later, I would like a place to digitally store and make available data that is collected during research studies.

6. Please rank your concerns about a KU open access policy based on the following points:						
	Not important	Somewhat important	Neutral	Important	Very important	Response Count
I am hesitant to assign non-exclusive distribution rights for my scholarly works to KU	22.7% (32)	3.5% (5)	27.7% (39)	26.2% (37)	19.9% (28)	141
I am concerned that highly selective publishers will resist any copyright variations or changes	7.7% (11)	12.7% (18)	14.1% (20)	38.0% (54)	27.5% (39)	142
I am unclear of the copyright requirements or issues associated with such a policy	7.9% (11)	7.2% (10)	23.7% (33)	36.0% (50)	25.2% (35)	139
I am concerned that it will impact the citation value and will not count towards tenure	30.9% (43)	9.4% (13)	20.9% (29)	23.0% (32)	15.8% (22)	139
I am worried about the risk to the patentability of my ideas	46.4% (65)	10.7% (15)	25.0% (35)	10.0% (14)	7.9% (11)	140
I am concerned it may impact certain grants and research activities	36.0% (50)	10.1% (14)	23.7% (33)	15.1% (21)	15.1% (21)	139
I already submit to a pre- or post-print server	53.1% (69)	0.8% (1)	31.5% (41)	6.2% (8)	8.5% (11)	130

7. Please offer any additional information regarding potential problems with an open access policy:
... 130 respondents had no comment to this question ...
"Open Access" publication undercuts the financial viability of journals and publishers, which depend upon subscription fees and royalties to continue in operation. If a significant portion of the materials contained in a journal can be accessed free of charge, who will pay for subscriptions to journals or for later use of their materials? So any "Open Access" plan must include alternative means of funding journals. Alternative proposals to date, such as submissions fees or publication charges paid by authors, are not viable for humanities journals. Even in other fields, such fees would be very burdensome, and ultimately universities would end up bearing much greater costs than the current "institutional" rates for subscriptions. It is not an option to fund journals out of society membership fees, except when societies are huge and their members are well-compensated, and independent journals would necessarily go under. Universities could underwrite the costs of journal operations directly, but they have proven reluctant to provide even partial subsidies, and in the current economic environment, this would not be a viable option. If journals become financially non-viable, then the value they add to scholarship: peer review, with its screening and enhancing functions, and expert editing, which guarantees accuracy, would be lost. If "Open Access" means that a lot more stuff is available, but it is all of highly suspect quality, then the scholarly community has lost more than it has gained.
As long as this means you are not asking already overtaxed faculty to do more work for free - that is, not providing staff to do this work of making the articles accessible - then it is ok - otherwise - why should I bother when I can send PDFs right now to those who request them.
Do you mean this part of the survey to be agree and disagree? The questions don't make a great deal of sense as important and unimportant, so I have answered the ones I understand in the current format. I find the current KU policy about ScholarWorks very cumbersome. I have found that those writing the policy do not understand the realities of scholarly publishing in the humanities. The journals in which I publish do not allow me to circulate my work on my own. That is the reality in which many of us publish.
Having an open access policy at KU would put me and many others into a bind with publishers. Success in my field depends on article publications in journals, which request exclusive copyrights prior to publication. I would fear that my chances at publication would be at great risk if I were required by KU to request the publishers to change this long-established manner of business.
i am in favor of OA. have published in OA journals. and put all my data on my website. what benefit to me - given it will take effort - will it be to also have my stuff on a ku server? googling is unlikely to rank the ku site higher than the nih site. how does the university propose to store this phenomenal amount of data forever, and have it easily accessible to the general public?
I am not sure how questions d and f of question #6 would work. More information is needed to correctly assess these questions.
I think having earlier drafts of papers that have subsequently been changed after peer review is dangerous
It might substitute for convention presentations where give and take exchanges are very constructive, especially for younger scholars. I believe that conferences are critical, especially for younger scholars.
KU has been aggressively seeking ownership of certain types of research products. See the recent requirement to sign an intellectual property assignment to KU. If KU wants to own and distribute my work the way a company does, they need to compensate me the way that company would. If this open access policy is a service to researchers who wish to use it, I have far fewer concerns than if it becomes a requirement for all to use it. KU seems to be moving towards the latter in many areas that impact my work.
Lost access to journals or time and money spent negotiating agreements.
Most significant publishing is already immersed in various copyright and exclusivity deals, including

digital versions. I don't see how a single-university arrangement could improve matters.
My essays are already available through MUSE and I do know my journals would charge a fee to allow the essays to go "public." My book pubs also require a fee for others to use excerpts. I am not entirely clear on these questions.
Need to address constraints imposed on research projects that are funded by industry or military
No concerns. Open access is a key next step forward for academia.
Not required since faculty can post on their own home pages.
nothing restricting academic freedom is acceptable. Mandatory provisions are unacceptable.
Obviously any policy should be flexible to issues of patents, copyright, and journal publication requirements.
Publishers receive before they give
See previous comments.
The descriptors given do not apply to these questions.
The first question is "I am hesitant..." I marked this "important" to emphasize the "hesitant" part of the question.
The issue of how open-access would work in tenure evaluations would have to be worked out before a system such as this is implemented.
The last question does not seem to be rankable according to the criteria provided. It seems to be a yes/no question.
The policy must not negatively affect tenure and promotion decisions if the policy does affect one's ability to publish in the most desirable venues.
The question asks me to rank the importance of my concerns, but the items list Agree/Disagree questions regarding usage.
The response categories for the above questions do not make sense
These questions are worded in a way that does not get at the nature of my concerns and any aggregation of results will result in uninterpretable findings.
We use SSRN in our discipline. The KU website would be an additional/complementary place I would need to post my work, not a substitute website.
Will the open access version of my articles be the "as-published" version OR will it be the "last draft before publication" version? I prefer the former.

8. Are there specific aspects of your particular field of inquiry that will complicate implementation of an open access policy comparable to that of Harvard University? If so, please describe them in detail.

... 83 respondents had no comment ...
1. granting a copyright I do not have ability to extend in many cases is illegal and unethical. Do not ask me to do so. 2. This has mandatory language ("each Faculty will provide"); is there an enforcement clause as well? Is there a scholarship police? 3. I suspect that all ramifications of Harvard's policy have not been fully investigated or followed-through yet. Do not glibly gloss over the potential damage to KU faculty. Frankly, I do not care that Harvard University has this policy. We are not Harvard. Not all aspects of Harvard are worth emulating.
a lot of our funding is from industry. that will probably be negatively impacted. so will alumni donations.....because our relationships will be compromised....
Articles prepared with co-authors from other institutions
As a scholar, I don't have the cachet of a faculty appointment at Harvard. I believe that open access to my work would cheapen it and make refereed publication (the gold-standard in my discipline) much more difficult.
As I wrote in my previous response, this policy would place at risk my ability to publish in my field.
as long as the policy specifies "scholarly articles" only, I do not foresee problems for my field of inquiry

As mentioned before, my articles are already available on a preprint server that is open access
Copyright agreements w journals and publishers.
Copyright should remain the property of the creator, not the institution.
Does not take pre-acceptance publication agreements into account.
Does the "worldwide license to exercise any and all rights under copyright" give the university the right to deny distribution? That would be very bad.
Harvard has, over the past ten or so years, focused significant expertise and resources toward developing a leading digital preservation program to guarantee (insofar as possible) reliably preserving digital content for ongoing future access. Faculty should require proof that their digital content is secure and will be maintained within an expertly-designed program that will keep it reliably accessible over time.
How will musical recordings or musical scores be handled?
How would this affect the publication of books, which are not advertising in the way that journal publications are, but are commercially sold and distributed?
I am a little uncomfortable with what the faculty member "will" do and the university "may." I would need someone to walk me through the reasons for this distinction.
I am not sure I understand this. If these are already published by a peer-reviewed journal, that is one thing. But otherwise, you can run into trouble.
I don't suppose there is anything specific to my field.
I don't want to hand over copyright where I control it, and our publications venues will probably only sell the copyright or hand over copyright after a significant number of years. What if I move away and am no longer affiliated with KU? Why should KU have rights over my research?
I have already commented on this subject
I have published several articles that have gone into print without any publication contract being sent me (particularly with special issues and scholarly essay collections). Would this policy be accompanied by a form that scholars would send to the publisher along with one's submission?
I just do not see how KU can ask or say to faculty that we exercise copyright when the journals make us sign over copyright as a condition of publication - I have no time to argue with publishers or try to work this deal with them - if KU somehow can bypass the fact that the publishers own the articles - then fine as perhaps there is some legal issue here I do not understand - but I am not willing to take time out to make sure KU has a copy of everything I publish - if KU wants a copy - seems to me they can get one from the publisher - it is not clear to me why each faculty member should be bothered to do this - I just do not see the benefit and I do see potential problems.
I would want to know more about the implications of giving copyright capacity to the university.
I'm not certain what the faculty give up to do this and how that plays with peer reviewed journals. . .
In humanities publications copyright is usually retained by the author, editor, or publisher of the material. Publishers in particular may not be willing to grant individual authors, or the university, permission to hold that copyright.
It would be important that the university licensing policy would not preclude submittal to a publisher of the professor's choice. If the publisher did not wish to share copyright and the professor prefers that publisher, the author's wish should take precedence as the author is the best arbiter of what is best for her/his career.
Journals generally demand ownership
KU makes itself look naive by setting up a copy cat policy that has been written even more onerously than any other
May make it more difficult to publish in established journals.
no
No
No
no
No

no
no
NO
no
No
No
No
No
No -- but the nature of format is critical to my ability to deliver. I may be unable to create such a document.
No, I think this policy would be implementable in chemical engineering. I am not familiar enough with the copyright restrictions of the journals I publish in to fairly judge the impact of this policy.
No, not if these are scholarly papers published in established journals that are simply made publicly available by KU.
No.
no.
No.
No.
No.
None
None of which I am aware.
None that I am personally aware of
Not clear how copyright can be handled when most Ed journals require that copyright be signed over to publisher as a condition of publication.
Not that I am aware of.
Not that I'm aware of
Not that I'm aware of.
Often authors don't hold the copyright and cannot assign it to their university. Many publishers will refuse to accept articles which would be made available immediately to anyone. In addition, many faculty will be hesitant to assign rights to a university that they may very well leave before the end of their careers. If I were to leave KU for another institution, why would I want KU Scholar Works to continue to post my publications?
One publisher already refused to give KU rights to publish. How many more will?
Open-Ended Response
Other than the fact that we aren't Harvard? I'm assuming that the rapacious parasites who run the commercial scientific publishers (Elsevier and their ilk) will do their best to push back on this, and things will be pretty unsettled for a while, particularly for junior faculty. Some of the professional associations, particularly those that maintain large bureaucracies, also won't be very happy.
Patents, I would want a provision that they could be held confidential until patent process has been initiated. I would worry about copyright issues with journals, but am not sure how this is working for Harvard. I assume they wouldn't do something that would prevent their faculty from being able to publish in a journal. Also, how will this policy interact with confidential/restricted/ITAR research policies. This is not my area specifically at the moment, but could be in the future and would need to be consistent.
probably not.
Some of my research involves the production of software. There are some cases, in that domain, in which an academic research writes code that depends on a library that it not freely-distributable (or one which requires explicit permission from the original author before redistribution). In such (rare) cases, it may be necessary for an academic research to list some aspects of a publication (what would typically be supplementary material) as "available from the author on request" rather than openly

available.
Some publications in my field are already state-of-the-art in this are (such as Library Trends).
Sometimes when a journal accepts a paper for publication, the author must sign a "copyright" agreement. Does this conflict with the policy from Harvard?
The production of an electronic copy is problematic. It can require special fonts or formats.
The transfer of copyright to the University is unacceptable on several levels--journals will resist this, faculty lose control over their own research, etc. What happens when a faculty member leaves the university? or retires? The main concern, however, is that it clashes with the journals' own policies, with the result that either the journals will refuse to publish such articles (made available through other means), or that they will refuse to grant authors permission to transfer copyright to the university.
This will not affect books? I am concerned this would affect contracts with book publications.
When publishing in certain journals, the journal owns the copyright. How does that affect this policy?
Why should I assign to the University copyright reprint priveleges of my creative work?
Would "hits" on my articles in the open access system "count" as a citation of my work?
Would a later instantiation of this policy go beyond scholarly articles to include analytic databases?
Yes, we do not have the funds that Harvard does to work on the negotiation of this policy.
Yes. If we use the Harvard model here, we should use it to support research. We do not provide research assistants to faculty (which in turn support graduate students) nor do we provide comparable support for attending professional meetings or giving papers. I have always been puzzled that administrators at KU as well as members of the athletic department get fully reimbursed for convention travel while faculty who give papers do not. Open access at Harvard and similar universities assumes a closer support relationship between research and the university than does KU. Closer support is not even in the goals of KU. Open access should be part of a larger policy of research support, not a one off item that brings greater cross-the-board benefit to the university but selective benefit to individual faculty members.
You will have to fire me to get me to sign anything over.

9. Are there aspects of your specific field of inquiry that will complicate your publication activities under an open access policy at KU? That is, do you envision open access initiatives comparable to that of Harvard University as a significant impediment to your publication activities? If so, in what way?
... 85 respondents had no comment ...
As above.
Copyright agreements w journals and publishers.
ditto
Does it mean that I cannot be paid by a publisher?
Don't know
Every single aspect of it. See comments above.
I am concerned that publishers may refuse to publish my research in their journals if they do not retain exclusive copyright.
I am not sure, but I think publishers sometimes ask me to sign copyright forms incompatible with such a policy.
I am very concerned that my publication opportunities will be reduced with this policy. Very concerned. While I appreciate that KU is forward-thinking, this does not seem to be the place to be an early adopter. I would like to learn more about how many other schools have this policy and get documentation from the journals in my field with how they treat the institutions with this policy.
I do not see any significant impediments.
I don't see what the reason a university or fellow faculty members would have to put their own faculty

authors in this kind of bind; the government seems to be doing that adequately. I think any policy needs to be thought through carefully—starting with the basic premises and answer why?
I don't know enough about it.
I don't know whether my future publishers would be amenable to these rules
I don't know. Will the next page have a policy statement from major publishers? How are they responding?
I don't need to use KU's proposed project--at least in the way it is being explained here.
I have already commented on these questions. The second question might require frequent appeal for waiver of the policy for specific articles for reasons relating to patents.
I have been developing a database for more than a decade. It is the primary product of much of my scholarly activity. I would like to see it preserved.
I have had some publishers agree to the contract addendum for KU Scholarworks and others balk. While I support us "taking control" of our work product, I'm concerned about the possible effects on university presses and commercial publishers that have to make a profit to survive. We should be careful what we wish for as we may end up having to not only create the work but publish it as well!
I have had to sign copyright transfer statements in the past with journals that would seem to not allow this. Are there any journals now that would not accept this?
I have no problem as long as this approach is compatible with the Journals for which I typically write. (I don't presently know their position on this.)
i publish in the journal "genetics" a lot. it is the journal of the genetics society of america, so i imagine its copyright transfer agreement is fairly standard: here is what they say: "Under no circumstances can an author deposit an article into a departmental or institutional repository, or distribute, use, or modify for any commercial or non-commercial endeavor without the permission of the Genetics Society of America. The corresponding author must also obtain permission to reproduce figures, tables, or text from other copyrighted material." i assume that ku will employ someone to ask for permission to do this for every article they wish to place in the repository?
I publish with large collaborations. Pre-prints should be no problem, but published journal articles may be
I see no negative effect of making available previously published works. I worry about patent related issues. In many cases, one wishes to keep particular patents out of the public eye and in other cases one wishes to publicize them.
I would be able to publish only in places that accept simultaneous open access. That would severely limit my options, and close off all the most prestigious journals and many of the most prestigious university presses.
If KU controls copyright, I anticipate problems with our publishing venues, univ. presses, journals, etc.
It is already difficult to publish industry data. Harvard, apparently, does not have this problem. Good for them. We do.
It is the acme of foolliness for librarians and Provosts to dictate anything about what we will or will not publish, and the way we distribute it.
It seems that this would compromise the publication of books. Also some journals and publishers will not accept material that has been previously published, including online publication.
journal copyright policies
KU has engaged in a number of initiatives that make work in my specific area more difficult - the restricted research policy and intellectual property ownership are the two best examples with Initiative One being the next to be implemented. I believe the open access initiative to be useful at best and benign at worst. However, I am suspicious of anything that is forced on me as a matter of policy. Make the resource available to those who wish to use it and do not force it upon those who do not.
Likely comparable.
My only concern is problems in ownership of copyright.
no
No

No
No
no
No
No
no
no
No
NO
no
No
No
No
No
No
No, I think this policy may improve my ability to publish, since it will be harder for KU legal authorities to curtail publication of ideas they wish to own.
No, not if these are scholarly papers published in established journals that are simply made publicly available by KU.
No.
no.
No.
None
None
not at all
Not that I am aware of.
Not that I'm aware of.
Once an article is in the open access process here at KU, I doubt if I could publish the article in a refereed journal.
One of the four professional associations I belong to -- the American Political Science Association -- will probably be very upset. The other three have smaller bureaucracies and are probably going to be less of a problem. Membership influence on the APSA, I would add, is essentially non-existent.
Open-Ended Response
Possibly--depends on response of publishers
potential conflict with NIH policy, potential conflict with journals' policies
See 8
See above. As an author and editor, I can foresee possible disputes over copyright, particularly for journals and books of individually-authored essays. Some of those authors may not wish to have KU hold copyright to their essays.
Some journals require that I give copyright to the journal.
What's special about Harvard?
Yes, having to write the "Dean of Dean's designate" every time one wishes to publish in a journal that does not conform to this policy. Soon, the University will be determining where we should publish based on open access policies.
Yes, I question the ability to publish in certain premier journals in my field with this policy.
Yes, see previous answer.
Yes. I believe that the implementation of this policy at KU could significantly hinder research in the humanities and my research specifically. In all of the works I've published, I have given the journal or publisher the right to circulate my work and this policy undercuts the publishers and journals ability to make a profit. I am concerned, especially for untenured colleagues, that this policy will make it more

difficult for people to find publishers. In terms of my work, I do a good deal of work with archives in Spain, who typically do not grant permission to circulate the contents of their collections in digital forms other than their own. I suspect that I would simply not be able to continue with these aspects of my research.
Yes. Publishers in my area are not agreeable to open access.
Yes. Publishers have refused to publish if the work will be available online.

10. Please comment in detail on any specific concerns or issues that the Faculty Senate should consider in developing an open access policy for KU:
... 88 respondents had no comments ...
Again, the main concern for me is how this system will impact tenure evaluations.
As an editor of a major journal in my field, I could not encourage authors to alter contracts without full knowledge of the legal and professional implications. I question whether this is legal and ethical conduct of science. First, I think altering the contract would put the author crosswise with the journal publishers (the ones holding the copyright). Even trying to alter the contract may have negative implications. Second, I think altering the contract would put the authors crosswise with journal editors (the gatekeepers to publication). In my case, the copyright forms are collected by the editor's office, so enforcement of copyright is the initial responsibility of the editor. It's not a simple matter for an editor to deal with such altered copyright forms. I would have spend time consulting with the publisher getting a response from the editorial staff and from the legal department of the publisher (the major one for the discipline). I would not be happy the first few times somebody sent in an altered copyright form. I assume that the publisher would establish a policy that I would have to enforce (and I'm fairly sure that my publisher would not approve the modification to the copyright). So, each time an altered copyright form came in I would have to spend more time responding. As the "gatekeepers" of the scientific disciplines, I feel the responsibility for publishing quality science, but I'm as human as the next editor. We usually are very unhappy with authors who cause trouble. Although I'm generally "accepting" of a range of authors' odd behaviors, this one would not make me happy and accepting because it causes trouble. Irritating the editor (and publisher) may be no big deal for some of the disciplines (e.g., those that have negligible rejection rates, almost everything submitted gets published, such that editors must be eager to accept material; or in disciplines where the journals are so heavily subsidized by grants), but this could be a very big deal for some disciplines, particularly those with high rejection rates. Getting published in some disciplines is hard enough (and is a requirement for promotion, tenure, and merit raises) and to get crosswise with an editor/publisher does not seem like a good way to proceed especially for junior faculty, who are typically nervous enough. What would happen if an altered copyright form came into my office: I would view it as a pain in the neck. In the crucible of decision-making about a submission, I might remember that pain and just avoid it. I should emphasize that I have advocated open access in all venues in which I can—on governing bodies that publish journals and in the council of editors. However, do let our own institution impose even more problems on the faculty--the administration finds enough ways to impose unfunded mandates and more paperwork on faculty and chairs--our own colleagues should not be looking for more ways to screw their buddies.
As I mentioned, I believe it should be part of a larger initiative of increasing support for faculty research, one consistent with resource allocation elsewhere. What has always impressed me about Harvard is that its research facilities tend to be first class, while its athletic and administrative facilities are not (except for the area of investment and fundraising--equivalent of our private, KUEA) whereas at KU the reverse is true. I et the feeling now we chase research that brings in overhead--a money making proposition--but the university (as opposed to individual units) seems indifferent towards research that does not. All of this is to say that we should fit open access--a worthy goal--within a larger comprehensive, examination and recommendations to increase research support at KU and to be honest about where research fits within university resource allocation. I believe that this is more important during times of cuts; we should be reviewing all priorities. It provides a time to get our

house in order. I do hope tht the faculty senate committee considers the larger issues. The survey is good for the narrow issues, but does not raise the fundamental issues about where this fits in within our larger research policies.
Can the university provide open access without transferring copyrights to the university?
Clearly, KU has a need to make the results of its research more broadly available.
Copyright issues and ownership of creative works are my main concerns.
For untenured faculty, the open access process may hurt their publication record.
Fundamental issues should include an explicit commitment to develop program that will guarantee reliable preservation of, and access to, digital content over time.
How does open access affect displays of your work for private concerns (ie: art shows, book fairs, conferences) during which your work is sold?
How will judgments be made for tenure and promotion about the "quality" of the publication?
I don't think that the policy should be mandatory. It should be optional.
I have already raised the issue concerning publication of books. Also would this then be required of all KU faculty or would it be possible to opt out?
I know some faculty fear that this means "giving over" their copyright. Education will be important here.
I strongly support open access
I would strongly oppose any manditory posting of materials on KU ScholarWorks. I think that it's a fine option for faculty members who wish to post materials, and who are able to do so without violating the terms of their copyright agreements.
I would think that journals would see this as a threat. What has been their reaction?
I would urge the Faculty Senate to keep it simple. One of the good things about Harvard's policy is that it apparently just requires the faculty member to send a PDF to the provost.
In the initial questions, it sounded as if faculty might be encouraged/expected to release their publications/research electronically through KU before they have been published in other journals. I would find this unacceptable.
It has to be very easy for us to comply.
It would be great if we as a faculty strongly endorsed open access. It would be consistent with some of the earlier along-similar-lines actions of KU, such as being key players in development of the Tempe Principles in 2000.
journal copyright issues
Let's get this policy in place so that KU scholarship can benefit from much-improved visibility and citation.
Many journals and conferences in my area require assigning copyright to the parent organization before publication. They may make exceptions for Harvard, but we are not Harvard. Anything we do should err on the side of not negatively impacting faculty publication. I am not yet convinced that this proposal goes far enough to do that and thus would oppose it if it were voted on today.
My field has already started to work on open access and have contacted KU library about it. Hopefully you have been briefed on the effort that has already gone into this and are aware of this
No problems for me. I fully endorse an open access policy such as Harvard's.
none come to mind
Open access participants contributes to universal nature of disseminating the knowledge. Hence, this activity should be taken into consideration in tenure/promotion decision.
Open-Ended Response
patents confidential/restricted/ITAR journal policies and what journals might not publish a work already released like this and finally faculty time. The main reason I haven't put most of my papers up on Scholarworks yet is I have to take time away from teaching/research/etc. to sit down and enter all the information, check journal copyrights, etc. Making it mandatory, if it is not very simple to do, will detract faculty from devoting time to their primary missions (being better teachers, doing more research, etc.).

Please educate the KU community on the open access concept and legal implications. How does this policy differ from the open access journals?
Please look closely into the ways faculty in the various fields publish or disseminate their work. What types of copyright agreements do they typically have to make with publishers?
Potential conflicts with established publishers.
Preserve intellectual property rights of the faculty rather than making a blanket grant to the institution.
Professional societies in my discipline rely on publishers' royalty payments as a major source of income. Open Access will reduce the profitability of journal publishing--which I support--but there are serious social ramifications.
Researchers in areas where intellectual properties might be thought to have value should be properly cautioned about the risks of open access with regard to the availability of patent protection both in the U.S. and beyond. I do have another concern, but I have hesitated to mention it throughout this process until now. I hope that scholarly publications will not converge with blogs.
See above.
Thank you for looking into this.
Thanks for keeping this out there for consideration. As someone in the library who is very conscious of the impact of faculty giving away scholarship for us to then buy I'm very supportive of efforts to explore what to do about this.
The draft policy is illegal. It appropriates a prior agreed right. Attempting to force the policy with sign-offs as conditions of employment will be illegal. Bad policy requires coercion and authoritarian methods: the draft is the worst conceivable abuse of authority.
The effort it will take to get copyright clearances from publishers
The Faculty Senate should generate an enforcement strategy such that engineers and scientists in particular cannot avoid submission of "pre-articles". Once such documents are in the public domain, the ideas contained within them cannot be patented, and thus the KU Legal staff cannot force faculty to work towards to eventual profitability of the University, and will encourage true scholarship.
The Kansas Geological Survey already hosts a robust web site for serving data and research for Kansas, including some research that is of interest to national and international individuals. The Kansas Open Access should not interfere with the state statute that forms the mission of the Survey to serve this data and research, but could enhance the availability of the information through an additional window for those seeking such information.
The migration to new video and audio formats is a potential disaster.
The policy must not be adopted.
The whole exercise seems pointless--who outside of KU will find these publications? Until there exists a world-wide infrastructure to search open access publications, most will be unread.
This puts a potential huge amount of work on the Dean or his/her designee. Have we queried the Dean's about this and understand the implications that the policy may have if implemented?
This very discipline specific. Therefore any policy should be very broad, and loosely enforced if at all.
This would mean that KU could potentially dictate the direction of individual faculty research after a few years. They could also control what material would eventually be publishable in certain fields. KU is simply not collectively smart enough to do this correctly at this time.
Violation of academic freedom
what does it offer over nih's version? will the university employ staff to upload our papers for us and all associated data? how is this going to be managed? if there will be indefinite storage, how will this be achieved? why does the university think this is going to increase the visibility of the university? if people google me or my research, i find it hard to believe they will come first to the ku server rather than to the nih websites or my personal website.
Why can't the faculty member retain the copyright instead of KU? It should stay in our hands.

11. Please comment specifically on your experience with, or your ideas regarding, KU ScholarWorks as a platform for sharing open access materials.
... 111 respondents had no comments on this comment ...
A boondoggle and waste of time. Never used. The people who read my work are at other universities.
Again, one publisher already refused to publish if I posted to ScholarWorks.
Frustrating. Tried to enter some older papers, get through the process and find out their copyright prohibits publication in open access. Lots of time and not much to show for it.
have not been a part of it yet, but would like to be.
Haven't bothered with it. If it is like most things that KU tries to implement involving IT, it will be screwed up...
Haven't used it. I post my articles on my own web site.
I am all for a volunteer-based repository for research results at KU. Scholarworks is ok. A mandatory policy would be 'just plain wrong'.
I believe that my published papers should be available to anyone.
I don't know anything about it. Why would anyone think to go specifically to KU ScholarWorks to look for an article?
I have had a book posted through ScholarWorks for 2.5 years and have had excellent feedback & use. Over 10,000 downloads plus a research award from my professional organization.
I have never used this platform.
I have no experience regarding such platforms.
I have no experience.
I have no familiarity with KU ScholarWorks.
I have no significant experience with KU ScholarWorks and no reason to expect anything but the best.
I have not yet seen any benefit to using this because it is not visible in my discipline.
I have only uploaded one of my articles there and haven't had time to do others. Is there any way to know how often anyone might seek access to articles there? Numerous data bases already provide open access with number of citations in other journals. Could KU ScholarWorks also list/monitor number of cites as well?
I have used one source there regularly. It is the kind of thing that is not publishable commercially, both because of its narrow audience and because it is rather slopply academically. Otherwise, ScholarWorks is irrelevant to me. I see no problem with existing means of dissemination of research in my field.
I have wanted to use it but have not because of the labor involved and I do not know who the gatekeeper is in my department.
I like the idea only for older, hard-to-find publications, e.g. articles and books that are out of print.
I love the idea. I have yet to implement it; I am concerned that it will make publishers balk, and honestly, I keep forgetting.
I personally never want to post unpublished materials, and my published materials are generally accessible to persons who want to find them. I don't see any compelling reason for me to post materials on KU ScholarWorks.
I think access via my departmental website, through a request and send mechanism I do not believe it is legal or appropriate to have articles available to webcrawlers to obtain outside of the legal and ethic I want to make sure that my concerns are conveyed to the KU Faculty Senate and in any communication with the administration. I am not sure I can trust the committee that is trying to formulate this policy to collect concerns of faculty over this policy. Please do not ignore legitimate concerns about the establishment of a policy, its elements, and its enforcement. I will be watching.
I'm not sure I would use it or be interested in it and I'm not sure anyone in my field would know to look for it as there are generally available other platforms that are recognized throughout the world for my area already
KU ScholarWorks is a safeguard for preservation, access and copyright of academic works. It has policy and regulation to protect the contributors.

KU ScholarWorks may provide one acceptable platform for receiving and sharing open access materials. Whatever platform is used will require the commitment and ability to reliably preserve, and provide long-term access to, digital content.
Low quality, incomplete, podunk, embarrassing. It's a bad idea for a local organization to inflate its own status at our expense, and try to re-invent the wheels that already work so much better elsewhere.
My contracts have not allowed me to contribute to ScholarWorks.
n/a I have not heard of it before
never heard of it.
No experience
no experience
No experience.
none
None
None
none, although I've been meaning to get copyright clearances for my publications so as to submit my materials to it.
Not used, not seen as important to dissemination since many journals have gone to on-line format.
Open-Ended Response
Scholarworks is fine for unrefereed works of general interest - like Susan Craig's dictionary of Kansas artists - that would otherwise never be published. But I don't use ScholarWorks - or any other open-access platform - for my scholarly work. Refereed publication is all I care about as a scholar, and the current system serves me well.
ScholarWorks is good!
ScholarWorks, while a great asset, is not especially user-friendly
see the comment about metadata standards above.
The Communication Task Force (Steve Warren) is also addressing these communication-related issues.
The focus is too narrow. It doesn't include open access to teaching materials.
There are more powerful databases and digital efforts ongoing worldwide. I think single-university efforts will remain secondary to this larger and more powerful tendency.
This kind of open access, while theoretically attractive, would actually undermine scholarship at the university. Journals will refuse to grant permission for articles to be available in this format. If the articles are published only in this format, the publication would have no credibility. KU ScholarWords would simply be a kind of vanity press.
Works fine for me.