



McCutcheon, Valerie, and Hubbard, Bill (2014) *ARMA Open Access Problem Solving Workshop June 2014*. Discussion Paper. Association of Research Managers and Administrators.

Copyright © 2014 The Authors

A copy can be downloaded for personal non-commercial research or study, without prior permission or charge

Content must not be changed in any way or reproduced in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holder(s)

When referring to this work, full bibliographic details must be given

<http://eprints.gla.ac.uk/94671/>

Deposited on: 23 June 2014

## ARMA OPEN ACCESS PROBLEM SOLVING WORKSHOP 11<sup>th</sup> JUNE 2014

### Issues – Level 3 – Voted Highest Priority

#### 3.1

##### Issue - Engagement

- Communicating Open Access Agenda to academic colleagues, getting them to think through relevant implications to them – particular in respect of publishing internationally.
- Academics level of understanding

##### Solutions

- Constant high level support 'you have to do it for REF'.
- If paying APC ensure (condition) that deposit of full text and metadata takes place

##### Other Comments

- Share details and outputs of the Jisc Pathfinder projects via the Open Access Special Interest Group list. **Action:** Valerie McCutcheon/Simon Kerridge

#### 3.2

##### Issue – REF Compliance

- Author may not get the email re acceptance if they are not lead.
- REF2020 making journal pubs/conference proceedings open access at point of acceptance.
- Achieving compliance with HEFCE OA policy for REF2020.
- Some orgs harvest so not at point of acceptance: additional work. Increase in resource to implement.

##### Solutions

- Acceptance is a good point as it is a precise point in time. It then gets published .... eventually
- Jisc AAM project – for metadata and AFV – early days – ask how this relates to harvesting currently in CRIS's. **Action:** Valerie McCutcheon to obtain more information and share with OA Special Interest Group list.
- Give support at point of acceptance of article.
- The policy is quite flexible with exceptions, embargoes and author judgement being accommodated which should allay fears about excessive 'gold' budget costs.

#### 3.3

##### Issue - Cost

- Funding of open access
- Discouraging publishing in good quality OA journals? – If no £££?
- Concern over cost of publishing e.g. Nature

- Resource costs of advocacy, checking, filing full text.
- What about organisations that don't have a grant?

### **Solutions**

- Its good – researchers don't need to cost in grants.
- Its good – if after grant there is funding available for OA
- If you don't have a block grant you don't need to comply with some embargoes etc.
- Keep OA funds (e.g. Nottingham) to cover cases where app to pay gold though no mandate or funder.
- Feed into the RCUK review

### **Other Comments**

- Is it really a demand? – Central fund created but perhaps only spent a small %.
- See <http://www.hefce.ac.uk/whatwedo/rsrch/rinfrastruct/oa/monographs/> and <http://open-access.org.uk/news/> for some work being done on costs associated with open access.

## **3.4**

### **Issue - Copyright**

- Harvard academics refuse to give copyright to publisher.

### **Solutions**

- Would need to be academic drive/community push
- Organisation to take some responsibility? – Give help with type of licences signed ensure work with REF/RCUK/Funders requirements.
- Ask publishers if will change licence type to facilitate compliance – they do sometimes...

### **Other Comments**

- Concern authors may just sign agreements without reading. They may sometimes contravene requirements inadvertently.
- Concern over industrial partners with further restrictions on papers – academics could breach contract just by publishing.
- Changes to terms and conditions would need careful consideration particularly where it could be interpreted as an attempt to limit "academic freedom" to publish.

### **Issues – Level 2 (before final Prioritisation)**

- Research data management to enable open access data (both storing and managing release issues such as anonymising for data protection).
- How can we ensure researchers notify us of acceptance?
- Monitoring HEFCE OA exceptions as they apply to proposed REF outputs.
- Improving and monitoring compliance

- Compliance with funder policies (including HEFCE's new REF policy)
- Money for gold fees –where from?
- Ensuring that we are OA – compliant for the next REF.

### Issues – Level 1 (Before any Prioritisation)

- Lack of academic engagement within the University (right from the top!)
- Engaging academics in open access agenda
- Awareness among academic staff
- Concerned not all academics are aware of open access and intricacies
- Academic Buy-in (e.g. re monographs)
- Implementing HEFCE's OA police for REF2020 – acceptance date needs large increase in resource to implement
- Budgeting and rationing funds for article processing fees.
- Allocation of APC funds (central funds – not grant funds)
- Getting money for APCs (non RCUK/Wellcome research)
- Cost will push upwards and so publication in the best journals will be based on ability to pay, and not quality of the research (and who pays? – HEI's will have to choose).
- Common vocabulary and metadata profile – V40A, OpenAire, and RIOXX why not one? **Action:** Valerie McCutcheon to obtain details of joined up specification and share with OA Special Interest Group Mailing List
- Publishers not complying with embargo periods set by HEFCE/RCUK policies may prevent outputs being published in the 'best' journals.
- Needed for publishing: simple guidelines for academics how to act and what it costs.
- Institutional buy-in at Senior Management level (and ownership of the various elements).
- REF2020 – point of acceptance – goes against our established embedded working practices (appreciate this won't affect all, but I think it will affect a lot)
- Gold – will we recoup costs in reduced subscriptions?
- Open access for raw data and what data should be made open access and how?
- UK leaping into the dark ahead of the rest of the world. Being driven by HEFCE. Cost of publication will push upwards very quickly – how will sector afford this (note Oxford estimate on annual cost for Gold = £21m pa). Impact greater on smaller/less research intensive universities.
- OA works better for some disciplines and types of output than others. Universities will need to change who can publish, and where they can publish – especially for smaller universities. Publication in the best journals will be based increasingly on the ability to pay.
- OA date acceptance or publication.

Bill Hubbard and Valerie McCutcheon June 2014