ASIS&T Publications and Open Access

The 2023 ASIS&T Publications committee was charged by the Board of Directors to “produce a white paper on the impact of OA on ASIS&T Publishing and potential business models for future publications that ensures break-even on open-access (OA) publishing.”

A note on terminology: The vocabulary of Open Access (hereafter abbreviated as OA) is dynamic and evolves rapidly. The Belgian research university KU Leuven provides an excellent and well-maintained glossary. That glossary may be helpful to readers of this paper.

This white paper offers some background on the arguments, incentives, and challenges for OA models. It explores some of the possible OA routes for ASIS&T and concludes with recommendations which, if adopted, will lead to a better understanding of the membership’s support for OA generally and for opening ASIS&T publications in particular. The recommendations are also intended to explore sustainable models for OA publishing for ASIS&T. While OA for JASIST and ARIST is outside the scope of this paper, JASIST does inform this analysis. JASIST/ARIST also presents a case for the urgency of addressing the questions posed by OA. Many authors, readers, and concerned scholars increasingly expect OA to publications, and many expect scholarly societies to find a way to support OA. Steve Sawyer, Editor-in-Chief of JASIST, points out, “The journal doesn’t have a choice. We have to deal with [OA].”

It is important to recognize that ASIS&T is not alone in its need to address the challenges of changing scholarly expectations and business models. Scholarly societies in all disciplines and across the globe recognize that the needs and expectations of both authors and readers have moved far beyond traditional licensing or purchase models. As Stuart Scheiber, a linguist and computer scientist at Harvard University once put it, while we assume” the societal benefit of open access to researchers and to the general public alike, . . . nonetheless, many scholarly societies, and the faculty that support them, are worried that open access – at least as they understand the concept – could exacerbate the serious financial distress that many of those societies are already under.” ASIS&T needs to both look to its peer societies and exercise its intellectual leadership in finding a sustainable model for OA the meets the needs of the organization and its members.

Background: ASIS&T and OA

Although ASIS&T does not have a formal OA program, the Association has been engaged with models for open publications for some years. JASIST, the flagship journal of ASIS&T, has long operated on a subscription model, with free access, including (until very recently) free print copies, for members. Subscriptions have been managed by Wiley, the journal’s publisher. ARIST’s Editor-in-Chief, Lisa Given, explains that this publication is now being relaunched and will appear as a stand-alone annual issue under the JASIST banner, with individual papers available via early view.
As Wiley’s OA models have developed, they have been made available to JASIST. JASIST now uses a hybrid OA model, wherein 45% of articles are OA while the rest are behind the subscription paywall. JASIST’s publishing options and article processing charges (APCs) are described briefly below:

- **Wiley’s JASIST page** promotes OA to authors (see the Appendix for a description of the variety of OA models).
- The open access article processing charge (OA APC) for JASIST is currently $3000, with discounts and/or exceptions made for authors at institutions with OA agreements with Wiley (see more on “transformative agreements” below), as well as for authors in developing countries. Paying the OA APC makes articles freely available on the Wiley Online Library; however, the fees may fall to individual authors to pay where OA APCs are only discounted or unavailable for waiver in particular countries. Articles published openly via an APC are assigned a Creative Commons Attribution license.
- JASIST authors can also opt for “Green OA,” a self-archiving model with two options that will be described in the following sections (see more in Appendix1).

The following charts offer an idea of the shift to OA publishing within JASIST over a 4-year period and, by inference, a sense of author demand for APC-funded OA to publish their articles. While the percentage has varied over the months, with some dips and plateaus, the Editor-in-Chief has observed that there is strong author demand for OA, and there are risks associated with this demand growing faster than the Association is responding. Some of this demand may be driven by country-level OA mandates under funding agreements (e.g., as is the case in the United Kingdom), or by particular disciplines where grant funding and/or institutional schemes support OA funding. However, these funding avenues vary by country and institutions, and are also affected by other factors (e.g., senior academics may have more access to OA publication funding than early career academics).
Percentage of Open Access Articles in JASIST Issues, 2019 to 2023*

Percentage of Open Access Articles in JASIST Issues, from 01/19 to 05/23
Authors at JASIST can choose from two Green OA options:

1. **Submitted (preprint) Version:** “The submitted version of an article is the author’s version that has not been peer-reviewed, nor has any value added to it by Wiley (such as formatting or copy editing).”

2. **Accepted (peer-reviewed) Version:** Self-archiving of the accepted version is subject to an embargo period of 12-24 months. According to Wiley’s policies, “The accepted version of an article is the version that incorporates all amendments made during the peer review process, but prior to the final published version (the Version of Record), which includes; copy and stylistic edits, online and print formatting, citation and other linking, deposit in abstracting and indexing services, and the addition of bibliographic and other material.”

**Wiley advertises and promotes** the advantages of publishing OA in JASIST as follows:

- “On average, OA articles were downloaded three times more.”
- “On average, OA articles were cited 50% more.”
- “On average, OA articles generated nearly three times as much Altmetric attention.”

Wiley also negotiates national and institutional “transformative agreements” with universities, consortiums, and countries for a shift to OA publishing, using institutional funds to cover or provide discounts on OA publishing costs.\(^1\) Publishing revenue negotiated through the agreements (usually funding a negotiated percentage of articles from the client institution and/or a discount on the OA APC fees) replaces the traditional bundled subscription contracts with libraries. To understand the scope of those agreements, please consult the full list of institutions and countries covered by Wiley transformative agreements. It is important to note that these agreements are negotiated individually, so can vary significantly across countries, institutional contexts, and for individual journals within a publisher’s entire suite of offerings.

**A first foray into OA: Information Matters**

In addition to taking advantage of Wiley’s OA models for JASIST/ARIST, ASIS&T has committed to the publication of Information Matters as a fully open “digital-only communication translational forum for information science, bringing relevant and current research evidence and industry developments, news, and opinion to a global public audience free of charge.” The editor of Information Matters stresses the importance of OA for that publication. He states, “OA is definitely a key element of IM’s offering, and our authors and readers enjoy them immensely. This is not just a desired feature, but a necessary one, given IM’s mission to reach audiences in all corners of the world, in all sectors of education and professions.”

**Information Matters** aspires to be self-sustaining through sponsorships. There are three levels of OA sponsorship:

1. Bronze ($1k),

---

\(^1\) See this useful primer for more explanation: [https://scholarlykitchen.sspnet.org/2019/04/23/transformative-agreements/](https://scholarlykitchen.sspnet.org/2019/04/23/transformative-agreements/)
2. Silver ($3k), and
3. Gold ($5k).

The Editor estimates the following: “If we can get 4 Gold a year, we can be almost break-even. Or we get 10 Bronze and 3 Silver. Or some other combination. But I’d say we would like to get half a dozen to a dozen contributors/sponsors per year who could provide one of these three levels of support.” To many institutions, a sponsorship, even at a higher level, may look inexpensive compared to the cost of subscribing to a scholarly publication. It does require considerable labor and attention to secure sponsorships, at any level, and this labor must be factored into the cost of publishing *Information Matters*.

The 2021-23 ASIS&T publications committee was charged with developing a proposal for a new publication. The working group that led the process asserted that its focus should be on internationalization and interdisciplinarity in information science. It was the firm position of this working group, supported by the rest of the committee, that any new society publication should be OA from the start for the following reasons: to recognize the discipline’s commitment to equitable access, to address the economic challenges of under-resourced institutions and scholars, and to demonstrate the value of ASIS&T membership.

The Board of Directors declined this proposal on the grounds that the focus of the new publication and its audience were under-articulated. The Board also expressed concerns that the Association could not afford to undertake another publication without a fully developed business model that would ensure the publication would break even. The work on this proposal, and the subsequent conversation it generated, are key drivers for the current white paper.

**Why OA?: Perceived and Documented Benefits of OA**

The driving forces for open-access publishing models are motivated by a range of socio-economic factors, all motivated by the desire to see research outputs freely available to the public. The OA movement has been led by academics and research institutions, as well as funders and policymakers, with a variety of shared interests in transforming the financial models behind scholarly communications.

Advocates of OA argue for its benefits to authors, libraries, and society more broadly. Authors may have both practical and ethical motives for OA publication. Many authors are also obligated by their employing institutions to share their work openly. Similarly, an increasing number of funders mandate OA to the results of funded research. Authors often meet this obligation through self-archiving. However, if authors can fulfill this obligation through direct, open publication that does not require their attention or labor to deposit elsewhere, they may face one fewer barrier to “opening” their work. That said, many discussions of OA address only journal publications, with little attention paid to books and other forms of academic publication.

Aligned with social justice movements across institutions, OA models are championed by scholars and students who advocate for global inclusion and equity of access to research
literature. Traditional models of publishing favor well-funded institutions, and privileged researchers are accustomed to broad journal literature access, often made possible by “big deals” with institutional libraries. Advocates of OA publishing are seeking to disrupt these dynamics in an effort to establish greater equity and global engagement with scholarly research and its outcomes, both by the general public and researchers and readers around the world.

Though many acknowledge and advocate for the benefits of OA publication, it is important to remember that existing OA models do not entirely level the financial playing field for most scholars. Disparity in institutional and individual budgets will still determine the degree of access available to any given scholar. From the perspective of the global South, OA is seen as a beneficial contribution toward social justice, as many scholars or institutions in this context still cannot afford OA APCs or are not engaged in transformative agreements. Transformative agreements are themselves still fee-for-service models, and these fees are not those that all authors, institutions, or libraries can afford. Also, as these agreements are negotiated by libraries (often, without involvement of authors and academics), there are concerns that these agreements may not address authors’ needs². Books, conference proceedings, and other non-journal publications are also not often mentioned in strategies seeking to support OA publishing, despite their prevalence in information science and other disciplines. There are strategies to address such disparities, such as article fee waivers or reductions based on institutional classification or location, or author petition or membership status, but there is not yet a widely accepted or deployed model that accounts for economic disparities or fully covers the cost of publication.

Funding agencies and OA Policies

In the United States, the White House’s Office of Science and Technology Policy issued a memo in 2022 calling “for agencies to update their public access policies as soon as possible to make publications and research funded by taxpayers publicly accessible, without an embargo or cost. All agencies will fully implement updated policies, including ending the optional 12-month embargo, no later than December 31, 2025”. This applies to funders such as the National Institutes of Health and the National Science Foundation.

Many major European funders, such as UKRI, have signed on to Plan S, “an initiative for OA publishing that was launched in September 2018.” The plan is supported by cOAlition S, an international consortium of research funding and performing organizations. Plan S requires that, from 2021, “scientific publications that result from research funded by public grants must be published in compliant OA journals or platforms.” Funding agency requirements have been satisfied through a number of different solutions, primarily either

- hosting the original author manuscripts (pre-peer review) on institutional or preprint repositories, or making the final version of record openly available after 6-24 months (also known as an “embargo period”).

---

² See “A Devil in the Details: Addressing Authors’ Needs in Transformative Agreements” by Lisa M. Given and Sarah Polkinghorne, November 2021
https://commonplace.knowledgefutures.org/pub/7p9agxhb/release/2
We may expect these requirements to continue to grow across funders and, as indicated in the [2022 OSTP memo](https://www.whitehouse.gov/wp-content/uploads/2022/09/ostp-memo-final-8-18-2022.pdf), expand to include all final publications and disallow an embargo period.

Beyond institutional and funder requirements to share scholarship openly, authors are also interested in choosing OA venues to benefit from the frequently asserted citation advantage enjoyed by OA journal publications. Evidence from *JASIST* suggests an OA citation advantage: Looking at *JASIST* issues from 1/1/18 to 7/26/22, 17 of the 25 top cited articles (68%) were published OA. The possibility of increased citation is a powerful motivator for many scholars, as well as the increased visibility, connectivity with other scholars, and network of disciplinary interest and collaboration. It is important to note that we do not know if this can only be attributed to OA publishing. Authorship, topic, and social media "push" by authors during the free access period (rather than long-term OA) could be contributing factors here. We need more data on longer-term trends; for example, if we looked at citation rates after the free access period that might give us more robust data here.

Logically, it follows that the citation advantage enjoyed by authors in OA journal publications should also accrue to the benefit of those publications. A 2019 study by Huang et al. cautions that the effect of OA on Journal Impact Factor (JIF) is under-examined, but still found that OA leads to an increase in JIF. Keeping in mind that there is an active critical discussion ongoing about JIF, we can also consider that while OA publications can be attractive venues for authors with funder obligations, they may also attract authors who believe that OA journals enable a wider global reach.

A high-impact publication venue is an oft-acknowledged contribution of the Association to its members’ work in support of their scholarly goals. Continuing to provide such venues, while also lowering financial barriers for both authors and readers, will increase the perception of value of Association membership, clearly indicating a return on the investment of membership dues and service labor. Embracing and sustaining OA will also be a demonstration of intellectual leadership, scholarship advancement, support of scholarly networks, and commitment to sustainability.

**Inhibitors and Challenges for OA Publishing**

While traditional publishing models charge fees for reading or accessing the final version of record for journal articles, the costs of funding OA must be recouped elsewhere. The OA movement shifts the costs of scholarly publishing from the point of access to the point of

---

3 The SPARC open advocacy organization monitors studies tracking the citation advantage of OA articles and in 2018 found that out of 70 OA studies, 46 found a citation advantage for articles available via OA. Research by Ottaviani (2016) published in *PLoS ONE*, discusses the flaws in a number of studies that suggested that OA articles attract more citations, but still found an OA citation advantage as high as 19%. Data shared recently by Web of Science suggests “the citation advantage” is declining in the last five years, where hybrid-OA journals have a higher citation rate than pure-OA journals, [https://twitter.com/Ann_K_Beynon/status/1651228473673875458](https://twitter.com/Ann_K_Beynon/status/1651228473673875458).
publishing. This creates many challenges for authors, editors, and supporting organizations, who are under pressure to rewire business models and publishing workflows to meet this demand.

- **Loss of recurring revenue:** Many scholarly societies that provide publishing venues have been largely funded by journal subscriptions, both individual and institutional. These organizations fear that a shift to OA will result in fewer opportunities to cover their costs. In the early years of the OA movement, publishers relied on APCs as a key funding opportunity; new models are now being established, including OA subscriptions (“subscribe to open”; see Appendix 1).

To illustrate this challenge, consider the contribution that the current publishing model for *JASIST* makes to ASIS&T finances. In its most recent proposal, Wiley asserts the following: “We project that ASIS&T will receive a total of $2,305,901 in royalty payments over the next contract term, plus an additional $578,750 in editorial support payments and annual meeting sponsorships ($100,000 per year in editorial support and $15,750 per year for the annual meeting).” This revenue depends on Wiley’s hybrid model of subscription and OA, with no APC under the subscription option, and an OA APC of $3,000, under the OA option. The OA charge is one that many members consider is too high to be affordable by many scholars, particularly those in developing countries or under-resourced institutions elsewhere. While an OA model for *JASIST/ARIST* is not part of the remit of this current discussion, the open question of whether a shift to OA would compromise the journal’s contribution to the Association’s finances is a useful example of the financial considerations involved in developing viable business models for OA.

- **Unknown demand:** Awareness, ability to fund, and demand for OA publishing are not consistent across different areas of study in the information sciences, nor different types of authors (academic vs. practitioner). At present, the ratio of funded research in ASIS&T journals, and in our discipline as a whole, varies significantly between sub-disciplines, e.g., librarianship versus information systems or computer science, as well as by country. Even where grant funding is available for research projects, timeframes for publications and funder guidelines often prevent funds from being spent on publication fees (as many grant periods have ended by the time publications are submitted).

- **Concerns related to non-journal publications:** Most discussions of OA issues focus on journal article publishing, with little attention paid to book manuscripts, conference proceedings, artistic works, or other forms of publishing undertaken by scholars in information science (see Appendix 2). These non-journal venues also need attention with respect to OA publishing options, which requires additional investigation and support by the Association.

**Possible issues of ethics and quality:**
OA has given rise to a variety of concerns, some based in documented practices, some not necessarily supported by evidence.

- Open access is sometimes associated with a lack of peer review or with poor quality control. Some OA journals use review models other than those found in the traditional, pre-publication, closed approach, and these journals may be regarded as less reputable. Because many OA publications make use of creative commons licenses, some authors are uncertain about the protection for intellectual property and the alignment with traditional copyright protections.
- The transformative agreements being made at the institutional level in the US seem to be privileging scholars from well-funded institutions to have greater access to publishing their work OA. Some see this privilege as the antithesis of the OA theme of equity.
- One of the largest concerns is that OA journals are predatory: charging authors publication fees in exchange for marginal or nonexistent editorial attention, sometimes resulting in no publication at all. While it is clear that predation does take place under the guise of legitimate OA publishing, it is also important to note, as one JASIST article points out, that “predation in academic publishing is not a simple binary phenomenon and should instead be perceived as a spectrum with varying types and degrees of illegitimacy.” (Siler et al, 2020). There are also many OA journals striving to maintain the highest editorial and ethical standards such as those articulated in the Principles of Transparency and Best Practice in Scholarly Publishing by COPE, DOAJ, OASPA and WAME. Commitment to ethical, high-quality publishing at the core of ASIS&T’s values and its practice, so these issues may well not be germane. The reputational risks are noted here as a matter for attention, particularly in communicating about any plans for OA to society publications.

Appendix 1. Models for Supporting OA Publications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Benefits</th>
<th>Concerns</th>
<th>Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

4 See [https://www.science.org/content/article/fast-growing-open-access-journals-stripped-coveted-impact-factors](https://www.science.org/content/article/fast-growing-open-access-journals-stripped-coveted-impact-factors) and [Webinar - Scholarly Communication in Crisis: Research Integrity and Open Scholarship - OASPA](https://www.science.org/content/article/fast-growing-open-access-journals-stripped-coveted-impact-factors)


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Article Processing Charges (APCs), Gold OA, Hybrid Models</strong></th>
<th>APCs are charged to authors by the publishers, typically upon manuscript acceptance. APCs can be applied to all or some articles within a journal (those with a mix of OA and traditional articles are known as “hybrid journals”). APC-funded OA to the final version of record is often referred to as “Gold OA.”</th>
<th>Enables immediate OA publishing via author fees</th>
<th>OA APCs assume authors have access to institutional or grant funding for article publishing, and therefore are impossible for many scholars and often unaffordable for those in particular discipline areas and in the global South (therefore creating exclusionary, inequitable practices)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transformative agreements</strong></td>
<td>Known as “read-and-publish” or “publish-and-read” arrangements, transformative agreements aim to divert library budgets earmarked for subscriptions to instead fund OA publishing. Ultimately, this transitional model seeks to shift away from payment for readership to payment for publication.</td>
<td>Can successfully fund both OA publishing and read access for scholars and learners at research-intensive institutions.</td>
<td>Flipping of subscription money (from output to process) benefits those that have subscription budgets and high research outputs; however, these models do not adequately support the needs of scholars and learners at a variety of institutions. As agreements are negotiated individually, this leads to significant variation by country, discipline, and</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[https://www.nature.com/nature-index/news-blog/equity-concerns-persist-over-open-access-publishing](https://www.nature.com/nature-index/news-blog/equity-concerns-persist-over-open-access-publishing)  
‘Membership schemes’ provide a discount on APCs [Open Access Membership | Royal Society](https://scholarlykitchen.sspnet.org/2019/04/23/transformation-agreements/)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Association investment models</strong></th>
<th><strong>OA publishing available to all accepted manuscripts, funded by increased membership fees, sponsorship, and/or advertising programs.</strong></th>
<th><strong>Supports OA publishing for a wide range of scholars from all types of institutions.</strong></th>
<th><strong>Sponsorship or advertising programs require additional association resources and oversight; increasing membership fees will exclude those scholars or regions without significant funding and can result in canceled memberships.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Green OA</strong></td>
<td><strong>Green OA can either apply to the pre-publication manuscript (made immediately available via an institutional or national repository) or to the post-publication version of record (posted to a repository usually after a 12-24 month embargo).</strong></td>
<td><strong>A route to OA that preserves some or all of a journal’s traditional subscription revenue.</strong></td>
<td><strong>OSTP and other funders no longer allow for embargos on versions of record. Many authors have concerns with OA for pre-publication versions, particularly where errors or changes are made that resolve content issues in the final (version of record) work.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subscribe to Open and Shift to Open</strong></td>
<td><strong>S2O redirects library subscription revenue to an OA</strong></td>
<td><strong>Levels the OA playing field for institutions</strong></td>
<td><strong>Sustainability and equity of this model has</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong><a href="https://subscribetopencommunity.org/">https://subscribetopencommunity.org/</a></strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**even across journals within a publisher’s entire suite of publication offerings.**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model Type</th>
<th>Costs and Benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Volunteerism</strong></td>
<td>- Publication costs are borne by the community of interest's volunteer efforts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Zero cost to the inquirer and reader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Sustainability of ongoing/continuous volunteer labor, as for example during the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pandemic when ALA RUSA’s RUSQ 'paused' and has not been published for 3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- [<a href="https://journals.al">https://journals.al</a> a.org/index.php/r usq](<a href="https://journals.al">https://journals.al</a> a.org/index.php/r usq)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Diamond OA/Sponsorship</strong></td>
<td>- Some or all of the costs of publication are borne by a sponsoring institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Zero cost to the author and the reader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Sustainability of ongoing cost being covered by an institution, as for example</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Information Research, which has been supported by multiple university sponsors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The same applies to the library as publisher - see [<a href="https://librarypubl">https://librarypubl</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ishing.org/about /](<a href="https://librarypubl">https://librarypubl</a> ishing.org/about /)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Advertising</strong></td>
<td>- Some or all of the costs of publication are</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Zero cost to the author or the reader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Editorial independence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- <a href="https://libraryjournal.org/">Library Journal and School Library Journal</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
borne by the use of advertising

Appendix 2. Information and Computing Output, 2019-2023

Source: Dimensions
Open is more than 50 per cent of output, with preprint server arXiv the most-used single outlet

Recommendations

These recommendations are intended to lead to a better understanding of ASIS&T’s memberships’ support and desire for OA publications, to communicate to that membership the society’s position on OA and to explore paths to opening ASIS&T publications.

1. **Poll ASIS&T membership and wider community:** Launch a survey to measure the awareness of and interest in OA among ASIS&T members, as well as our broader community of authors, readers, and reviewers of ASIS&T publications. Specifically, we should assess the following:
   a. the level of demand for OA publishing,
   b. the ability of authors to pay for OA publishing
   c. the drivers of this demand (funder mandates, visibility, citations, and/or altruism),
   d. interest in a volunteer-supported journal, and
e. the degree to which authors are
   i. working at institutions with transformative agreements and
   ii. aware of those agreements and
   iii. their views on whether those agreements meet their needs.

2. Host an open conversation on OA for ASIS&T: Find a time at the upcoming annual meeting when attendees can join members of the publications committee (including some of the authors of this paper), the editors of ASIS&T publications and interested members of the staff and the Board to engage in open discussion about the value that the membership places on OA. This conversation should address the potential impact on overall submission rates if ASIS&T publications are not included in institutional/transformational agreements. A summary presentation of this white paper could be used to launch the conversation.

3. Hold a Board of Directors conversation defining return on investment: the working group and the larger publication committee believe that the board needs to consider that an OA publication may NOT cover its costs directly through generating revenue but may still be an asset to the organization. The Board should discuss what level of investment in a “loss leader” is acceptable and what metrics are necessary to determine the value of continued investment. That discussion would inform the “OA position” suggested by recommendation #4.

4. Establish OA position: Informed by the results of this survey, ASIS&T might publish a formal statement about the Association’s position on, and contributions to, the OA movement, including journal publications, as well as book manuscripts, conference proceedings, and other publication venues. Specifically, the Association might make reference to Information Matters as an example of our investments in sustainable OA publishing and our future plans.

5. Consider other publishing arrangements, such as a partnership with library publisher model: for example, see Digital Scholarship (digital-scholarship.org) and sustainable options for this.

6. Establish a timeline to make some decisions: Ask Wiley what their plans and timeline are for doing away with the embargo policy, in accordance with OSTP’s memo, as they will need to address this for all journals with OA funding.

7. Ask Wiley to waive all OA APC charges for ASIS&T members: This could increase value of membership and lower costs for some authors; however, a close examination of individual and institutional member fees compared to APC fees should be undertaken as part of this possible approach. A membership waiver model could also be considered for other publications.
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