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How can the responsible engagement of the scientific communities with open knowledge practices be stimulated? In what way may current evaluation protocols hinder the development of open science and scholarship? Which new indicators can be developed to ensure that the...
Plan S

Accelerating the transition to full and immediate Open Access to scientific publications

The key principle is as follows:

“After 1 January 2020 scientific publications on the results from research funded by public grants provided by national and European research councils and funding bodies, must be published in compliant Open Access Journals or on compliant Open Access Platforms.”

IN ADDITION:

- Authors retain copyright of their publication with no
- When Open Access publication fees are applied,
Response to Plan S from Academic Researchers: Unethical, Too Risky!

This is an appeal by several European scientists protesting against Plan S, recently revealed by the EU and a coalition of European research funders. Lynn Kamerlin and her coauthors worry that Plan S will deprive them of quality journal venues and of international collaborative opportunities, while disadvantaging scientists whose research budgets preclude paying and playing in this OA league. They offer instead their own suggestions how to implement Open Science.
Robert-Jan SMITS is the Open Access Envoy of the European Commission, based at the European political Strategy Centre (EPSC) of the European Commission. In this capacity, Robert-Jan has to propose concrete policy recommendations to ensure that by 2020 all publicly funded scientific publications are available in Open Access.

Prior to joining the EPSC, he was from 2010-2018 the Director-General of DG Research and Innovation (RTD) at the European Commission. In this capacity, he was responsible for defining and implementing the EU policy and programmes in the field of research and innovation (average annual budget 8 billion euro).
What’s ‘unethical’ about Plan S?

Posted on September 18, 2018 by jbrittholbrook

In a recent blog post, my co-authors and I refer to Plan S as ‘unethical’. Doing so has upset Marc Schilitz, President of Science Europe.

J Britt Holbrook @jbrittholbrook · Sep 17, 2018
Replying to @marcschilz1
@MsPhelps and @jeroenbosman do a great job of addressing the four proposed ‘solutions’ in our original piece. Their target was not so much our critique of Plan S, which you call “unsubstantiated.” May I ask what you mean by that and what would count as a “substantiated” critique?

Marc Schilz
@marcschilz1

1/3 Well, it starts with the title, where Plan S is bluntly termed “unethical”. This is a very strong qualifier for a plan that was, after all, endorsed by Research Councils from 11 countries and the European Union.
5:47 PM · Sep 17, 2018
Academic freedom and responsibility: why Plan S is not unethical

Posted on October 1, 2018 by Stephen

Since its announcement on 4th September the European Commission’s plan to make a radical shift towards open access (OA) has caused quite a stir. Backed by eleven* national funding agencies, the plan aims to make the research that they support free to read as soon as it is published. This is a major challenge to the status quo, since the funders are effectively placing subscription journals off limits for their researchers, even if the journals allow green OA (publication of the author-accepted manuscript).
On Academic Freedom and Responsibility

Posted on October 1, 2018 by jbrittholbrook

Today, Stephen Curry published a piece on his blog on “Academic freedom and responsibility: why Plan S is not unethical,” and I want to offer a response to some of his arguments here.

The first thing to say is that I think Curry and I agree on quite a few points. We especially agree that to speak of academic freedom means we should also to speak of academic responsibility. For six years (2012-2018), I was a member of the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS) Committee on Scientific Freedom and Responsibility. I fully support the AAAS Statement on Scientific Freedom and Responsibility, which the Committee co-authored:

"Scientific freedom and scientific responsibility are essential to the advancement of human knowledge for the benefit of all. Scientific freedom is the freedom to engage in scientific inquiry, pursue and apply knowledge, and communicate openly. This freedom is inextricably linked to and must be exercised in accordance with scientific responsibility. Scientific responsibility is the duty to conduct research and communicate findings in a manner that promotes public health, safety, and welfare."
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Academic freedom

Since the plan’s launch, an argument has also flared up over whether funders should be able to restrict where academics can publish. Britt Holbrook, a philosopher at the New Jersey Institute of Technology in Newark, co-wrote a blog post arguing that the plan is unethical because mandating where researchers publish impinges on academic freedom. His co-authors include some European scientists, such as biochemist Lynn Kamerlin at Uppsala University in Sweden.

But other researchers disagree. Peter Suber, director of the Harvard Open Access Project and the Harvard Office for Scholarly Communication in Cambridge, Massachusetts, says that it is entirely reasonable for funders to put restrictions on how their money is used. Suber, who is meeting with Smits on 4 October, says that taxpayer-funded public research agencies have a duty to spend their money in the public interest.

For his part, Smits says it is a “pity” that the academic-freedom argument is being used, “because it stifles a lot of debate”.
Architect of bold European open-access plan heads to Washington to garner US support

Robert-Jan Smits takes Plan S to the White House to seek support from US funders and policymakers.
Robert-Jan Smits declares it a “pity” that arguments about academic freedom are stifling debate on his ‘Plan S’, which promotes a radical shift towards open-access publishing (see *Nature* 562, 174; 2018). In fact, the opposite is happening.

Spirited debates on the topic are ongoing among researchers, publishers, librarians, journalists, funders and members of the public (see, for example, go.nature.com/2qtsrb; go.nature.com/2coxgrx; go.nature.com/2nm2dmq; go.nature.com/2cknrc; go.nature.com/2qw2hv6). We have yet to reach agreement on what to make of the major European funders’ radical shift to compulsory open-access publishing by 2020, but we continue to explore this important issue in good faith.
Argument

If we want to encourage academic flourishing, then we need to revalue academic freedom.

We want to encourage academic flourishing.

Therefore, we need to revalue academic freedom.
Open Access is merely a means to achieve Open Science.
Open Science

Open Science implies *democratization* of knowledge.

Essential tensions (balancing ‘internal’ values):

- Individualism and communalism
- Improvisation and conformity
- Revolution and ‘normal’ science
- Transformative and incremental research
Open Science

Open Science implies *democratization* of knowledge.

Essential tensions (balancing ‘external’ and ‘internal’ values):

• Accessibility and expertise
• Accountability and autonomy
• Broader Impacts and Intellectual Merit
• Finding cures and finding treatments
Academic Freedom

TWO CONCEPTS OF LIBERTY

An Inaugural Lecture delivered before the University of Oxford on 31 October 1958
Academic Freedom

• Negative freedom means freedom *from* ….  
  • Emphasizes individual liberty  
  • Sees all limitations on individual liberty as evils, only some of which are necessary

• Positive freedom means freedom *to* ….  
  • Emphasizes group liberty  
  • Sees some limitations on individuals as opportunities to maximize self-determination
Academic Freedom

• Negative freedom means freedom *from* ….  
  • Whether to publish in OA journal should be up to individual researcher.
  • OA mandates of any sort are not necessary, just evil!

• Positive freedom means freedom *to* ….  
  • OA maximizes impact!
  • OA mandates will allow researchers to maximize their impact and allow science & society to benefit from research.
“What about the freedom to read? If I am to have ‘full freedom in research’, I would need freedom from want and constraint with respect to access to research materials. The inability to read academic research that I cannot afford is undoubtedly an impediment to my research. It curtails my ability to conduct research that I lack access. This is a great example of the fact that academic freedoms often come into conflict with one another. Your freedom to publish behind a paywall inhibits my freedom to conduct research.”

– Martin Paul Eve
We recognise that researchers need to be given a maximum of freedom to choose the proper venue for publishing their results and that in some jurisdictions this freedom may be covered by a legal or constitutional protection. However, our collective duty of care is for the science system as a whole, and researchers must realise that they are doing a gross disservice to the institution of science if they continue to report their outcomes in publications that will be locked behind paywalls.”

– Marc Schiltz
Balancing
“A slave is not free, even if the slave is subject to a master who never interferes with the slave’s choices or actions. Simply being subject to the will of a master (*dominus*) renders the slave subject to domination, even if the master never exercises that power. According to the neo-republican conception of freedom as non-domination, then, a slave is not free, no matter how little their master interferes in their life.”

– J. Britt Holbrook on Philip Pettit
Interpreting
Transvaluation of Academic Freedom

Revalue academic freedom to encourage academic flourishing.

• Begin with – and value – individuals
• Resist dogmatism
• Embody change
• Exemplify risk taking
• Challenge established methods of evaluation
Academic Flourishing

• Seeks new standards

• Individuals seek to meet standards *and* exhibit originality

• Should be judged relative to individuals and change as individuals become who they are

• Requires risk taking

• Extends peer review (in ways that democratize knowledge)
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