

ANGLIA RUSKIN UNIVERSITY

POLICY ON OPEN ACCESS PUBLICATION OF RESEARCH

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1. Research is a public good. To obtain the greatest benefits from research, it must be shared as widely and as openly as possible. Specific potential benefits include:
 - Increased opportunities for enabling public engagement with research, and for reaching the users of research across the public and voluntary sectors, business and industry, etc., better positioning research to have impact
 - Improved efficiencies in research, increasing the amount and availability of readily-available information, and enabling the application of the latest tools and services for its organisation, manipulation and analysis
 - Greater opportunities for interaction, developing collaborations and networks with researchers around the world
- 1.2. Making the outputs of research openly available is essential to ensure the greatest levels of transparency and accountability, allowing the highest standards of research integrity to be maintained, and ensuring best practice in research. Given that most research is funded, directly or indirectly, and to varying extents, by the tax-payer, it is also only right and proper that the outputs of research are freely available to those who fund it.
- 1.3. Open access (OA) has become an increasingly important aspect of research dissemination. More and more research funders, and other parties with an interest in research, including national and supranational governments, now see OA as the norm. (See Appendix A for a contextual survey. Key funder policies are listed in Appendix B.)
- 1.4. Anglia Ruskin University shares these views, and has increasingly engaged with OA, launching the Anglia Ruskin Research Online (ARRO) repository in 2010, and creating the Open Access Support Fund in 2014. This Policy on Open Access Publication of Research is a product of these internal and external drivers and developments.
- 1.5. While this policy is driven by an institutional recognition of, and support for OA, it does not remove from researchers their academic freedom in choosing where and how to disseminate the outputs of their research. For example, some journals do not meet RCUK or HEFCE expectations on OA. The decision to choose such outlets, and the consequences of doing so, rests with the individual researcher concerned.

2. POLICY ON OPEN ACCESS PUBLICATION

- 2.1. Anglia Ruskin academic and research staff and students are expected to make every effort to maximise opportunities to make the outcomes and outputs of their research freely and openly available. As a general principle, research outputs should be placed in the most appropriate outlet in respect of their academic discipline and potential user audience, to maximise their visibility and dissemination.
- 2.2. Anglia Ruskin has deliberately not established an institutional preference towards 'green' or 'gold' routes to OA; this may be a product of the academic decision about where to publish.¹ If however the researcher has a choice between green and gold OA,

¹ 'Green' OA means research outputs being made freely available in an institutional repository and/or a subject repository, usually after the expiry of a post-publication embargo. It operates in parallel with traditional publication processes. 'Gold' OA usually involves the payment of an Article Processing

they are asked to consider the cost benefit of paying to publish, set against the possibility of the output becoming available freely, via a repository, at the expiry of any embargo period. Such considerations might include, *inter alia*, the nature of the research being reported, the potential audience for it, the cost of paying for open access and the duration of any applicable embargo. A stronger argument could be made, for example, for paying to publish research which can be easily applied by non-academic users, and which would otherwise not be available to them for a long time, than highly theoretical research primarily of use to other academics, likely to be able to access it via existing institutional subscription arrangements.

- 2.3. Anglia Ruskin academic and research staff and students whose published research outputs, of any type, and whether singly or jointly authored, are derived from their employment by or study at our University, from external research grants held by our University or internal support provided by our University, including through the provision of University resources and facilities, are normally required to deposit those research outputs in ARRO. Where work is jointly authored by two or more Anglia Ruskin academic and research staff and students, it is not necessary for each to deposit a copy. For the avoidance of any doubt, outputs published under the 'gold' route to OA must also be deposited in ARRO. Doing so is necessary for such papers to be compliant with REF OA policy, as opposed to being eligible under exceptions.
- 2.4. In line with expectations for the next REF, journal articles and conference contributions must be deposited as soon as possible after acceptance and not more than three months after that date; evidence of the date of acceptance, e.g. correspondence from the publisher, must be supplied.
- 2.5. Such deposit should entail a full-text copy, in a searchable machine-readable format, of the published version of record where it is available, and if not the author accepted final version of their manuscript, accompanied by a bibliographic / metadata record through which will enable the output to be discoverable. Exceptionally, where the output has been deposited in a subject repository, a bibliographic / metadata record only may be created in ARRO, with a live link to the output itself in the subject repository, so long as the other requirements of this mandate are met.
- 2.6. The output should become freely and openly accessible as soon as possible after deposit, respecting any post-publication embargo periods required by publishers (for journal papers and conference contributions as captured in the SHERPA ROMEO look-up service, so long as these do not exceed 12 months (for STEM subjects) or 24 months (for non-STEM subjects)). Reuse of the output should be permitted on terms not more restrictive than the Creative Commons CC-BY-NC-ND licence, which is the default licence setting in ARRO, though use of the Creative Commons CC-BY licence is strongly recommended in preference. Where an output has been published under the 'gold' route to OA, the licence used should be reflected in the licence selected for deposit in ARRO.
- 2.7. Where research outputs supported by external research funding are subject to more stringent requirements, these override those mandated here. Colleagues are reminded that such funders may also have additional requirements which must also be met.
- 2.8. Anglia Ruskin research students are also required, in line with our Research Degree Regulations, to submit a digital copy of their thesis, amended as required by their examiners, for deposit in ARRO and harvesting by the British Library's EThOS service.

Charge (APC) to a publisher, in return for which they will make the output freely available on their own website immediately on publication.

- 2.9. The submitter must ensure that in depositing to ARRO, third party copyright is not infringed. Our Research Degree Regulations provide more advice for research students.
- 2.10. Occasionally, there will be examples of research outputs that should have met the above requirements, but in practice do not, or even more exceptionally cannot. In such cases, best efforts must be made to retroactively meet these requirements as far as possible. Particularly in respect of outputs which have not met open access requirements for submission to the next REF, an explanation and, if available, supporting evidence, must be retained and provided to enable robust decision-making about the output's eligibility for submission under the 'exception' clauses of the REF policy.
- 2.11. For the avoidance of any doubt, this mandate does not extend to the outputs of research produced by Anglia Ruskin staff and students prior to those individuals having a formal connection with our University. Nonetheless, we recognise that such individuals may wish to include such prior work. If so, we will normally place in ARRO a bibliographic / metadata record only, with a live link to a freely-available version of the output itself in another institution's repository, a subject repository, or journal / publisher website. Where the output is not freely and openly available elsewhere, however, ARRO can be used to host it, as a 'repository of last resort'.
- 2.12. A set of brief FAQs supporting this open access policy is at Appendix C.

3. CONSEQUENCES OF NON-COMPLIANCE WITH THE POLICY ON OPEN ACCESS PUBLICATION

- 3.1. Failing to meet the external Open Access policies of research funders, and perhaps most importantly of HEFCE in respect of the next REF, could have significant negative consequences for our institution and its reputation.
- 3.2. Therefore, while reaffirming that this Open Access Policy does not infringe researchers' academic freedom in choosing where and how to publish specific research outputs, the general expectation of all researchers is that they normally make their research freely and openly available in line with the requirement set out above.
- 3.3. Persistent failure to comply, including over-reliance on the 'exceptions' clauses to justify non-compliance, is a serious issue which will be dealt with in accordance with our Staff Disciplinary Policy and Procedure.

4. QUALITY CONTROL OF RESEARCH OUTPUTS SUBMITTED TO ARRO

- 4.1. One of the original purposes of setting up ARRO was to showcase and preserve the research outputs of members of our University community. It follows, therefore, that the research outputs deposited and shared within it should be worthy of being showcased and preserved.
- 4.2. Where a research output has been externally peer-reviewed as part of a publication process, it is automatically assumed to be of sufficient quality to be deposited and shared within ARRO. Similarly, final versions of research degree theses can be deposited without further quality checks.
- 4.3. Unpublished work, or published work that was not externally peer-reviewed as part of a publication, will not normally be included in ARRO. Where it is felt that such work should, exceptionally, be made available via ARRO, the rationale for inclusion and the work itself

must be reviewed and approved. Responsibility for this sits with the Deputy Dean for, or Director of, Research in the Faculty of the submitting author. Work co-authored by two or more members of our University should be reviewed by all relevant Deputy Deans for, or Directors of, Research.

5. ANGLIA RUSKIN OPEN ACCESS SUPPORT FUND

- 5.1. The OA Support Fund is primarily intended for the publication of research outputs for which publication under the 'gold' route to OA is deemed appropriate and for which no other funding support is available. Colleagues whose research is supported by external research grant funding are expected to seek support from their grant funder in the first instance, as well as ensuring more generally that publication charges are accounted for, where possible, in research grant applications. Colleagues working collaboratively across different institutions are expected to ensure that APCs are supported collaboratively.
- 5.2. The OA Support Fund is available to all Anglia Ruskin academic and research staff eligible for submission to the REF, for the OA publication of journal articles. Funds will be awarded on a first-come, first-served basis.
- 5.3. Colleagues wishing to seek funds from the OA Support Fund must apply using the application form and guidance available on the RDCS website, and appending a copy of the output for which support is sought. Applications should be made when the output is ready for submission to a journal / publisher; applicants should await approval from the OA Support Fund before actually submitting their output for publication.
- 5.4. Applications are reviewed by the applicant's Deputy Dean for, or Director of, Research, whose primary concern is to establish that the output is of good (at least 2*) quality, and fits with Faculty and departmental strategy and plans for research, and by the Research Policy & REF Manager, RDCS, to check issues around eligibility and compliance of the proposed journal / publisher.

6. RESPONSIBILITIES

- 6.1. The following individuals and groups have the responsibilities within this Policy:

Responsibility	Owner
Submission of relevant metadata and the full text of, or link to, the final accepted or published version of the output, where required within 3 months of acceptance and provision of evidence of date of acceptance or details of exceptions	Anglia Ruskin authors
Retention of acceptance date and other exception information / evidence	Research Services Manager, University Library
Checking compliance of outputs submitted to the repository e.g. with copyright, publisher requirements and policies on OA	Anglia Ruskin authors; Library
Disciplinary action in respect of persistent non-compliance with the OA mandate	Faculty Dean
Faculty decisions on quality control of items certain submitted for inclusion in ARRO	Faculty Deputy Dean for, or Director of, Research
Applying for funding from the Anglia Ruskin OA Support Fund	Eligible Anglia Ruskin authors
Faculty decisions on applications to the Anglia Ruskin OA Support Fund	Faculty Deputy Dean for, or Director of, Research

Management of the Anglia Ruskin OA Support Fund	Head of Research Excellence & Enhancement, RIDO
Oversight of the Policy on Open Access Publication and of all matters retaining to OA at Anglia Ruskin	Open Access Working Group

7. REVIEW

7.1. This policy will be reviewed every twelve months, or more frequently as necessary, to ensure it remains current in the light of relevant regulations, funders' requirements and organisational procedures. The review will be led by the Open Access Working Group.

Version 5.1, approved by CMT on 22 February 2016

Version 5.2, amendments approved by OAWG following review on 1 November 2017.

APPENDIX A: BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

Modes of scholarly communication have changed rapidly over the past two decades, particularly thanks to the development of the internet and the adoption of electronic formats for the publication of research. This shift from an essentially Victorian model of scholarly communication has come about alongside an increasing realisation of the value of research as a public good, and that limiting access to those who can afford to pay for it is incompatible with the modern information society, accompanied by the corollary of academics, students, funders and the general public increasingly expecting unrestricted access to research outputs. Together these drivers have encouraged the development of open access (OA) publishing in which research outputs can be freely and universally accessed by anyone with an internet connection.

In the UK, the 'Finch' report, of the Working Group on Expanding Access to Published Research Findings, as well as making a clear recommendation about its preference in terms of the 'gold' publication model (discussed further below), strongly endorsed OA publication. Its findings were adopted by government and in turn the UK research councils and other funders of research, most of whom now expect that normally outputs from the research they fund is made available on an OA basis, as detailed in the examples in Appendix B below. Most recently, HEFCE has introduced a number of open access requirements which will apply to outputs submitted to the next Research Excellence Framework (REF). The developments in the UK have been paralleled internationally, with *inter alia*, US, Canadian and European research funding agencies adopting OA requirements.

The initial focus in the development of OA publishing was on scholarly journals, as the main form of scholarly communication, and for which a practical electronic publication environment, albeit not OA, had already been created as an alternative to more traditional paper-based publication. OA considerations are now starting to be applied to other forms of publication other than journal articles, and to other outcomes of research, such as underpinning research data.

Internally, Anglia Ruskin Research Online (ARRO), our institutional repository (IR), was set up in 2010 with the aim of showcasing and preserving the research outputs of members of our University community, and as a means of increasing exposure to our research work, benefiting both individual researchers and the institution. While not specifically created to address the drive towards Open Access per se, ARRO nonetheless is an important part of enabling open access.

We set up an Open Access Support Fund in the second half of the 2013-14 academic year, recognising the increasing number of reputable, respected journals operating on a pay to publish model, and to enable academic staff to publish in them. The OA Support Fund is increasingly used and has for 2015-16 saw its total allocation of funds increased by 40%.

Finally, during the summer of 2015 it was agreed to reconstitute the existing ARRO Working Group as the Open Access Working Group, formalising and extending its remit to oversee all matters relating to Open Access across our University.

APPENDIX B: KEY FUNDER EXPECTATIONS ON OPEN ACCESS

The UK Research Councils have, through their umbrella organisation RCUK, have had policies on Open Access since 2005, revamped most recently in April 2013. All peer-reviewed research journal articles acknowledging Research Council funding must be published in outlets which allow

- Immediate and unrestricted access to the final published version of the paper, under a CC-BY licence, via the journal's own website and by the immediate deposit of the paper in other repositories without restriction on reuse, usually involving payment of an Article Processing Charge (APC) *or*
- The deposit of the final peer-reviewed, accepted version of the manuscript in any repository, without restriction on non-commercial reuse, subject to a maximum embargo of 6 months (in STEM subjects) or 12 months (for non-STEM subjects), these periods doubling where no RCUK funding for APCs is available.

While RCUK's preference is for immediate, paid-for open access, its requirements can be met via self-archiving open access.

The European Union, in its Horizon 2020 funding programme, also introduced open access publication requirements in 2013, which extend to all peer-reviewed publications relating to Horizon 2020 results, though the EU acknowledge that the dominant form is the journal article, and merely 'strongly encourage' OA to be extended to other output types, including monographs. The EU require, for Horizon 2020 funded research:

- That as soon as possible after acceptance, and at the latest upon publication, a copy of the final peer-reviewed, accepted version of the output, or the final published version, is deposited in a machine-readable electronic format in a repository; *and*
- That as soon as possible after such deposit, the deposited output is made openly available, under an adequate licence (such as CC-BY or CC-0) *either* via the chosen repository, subject to embargo periods of no more than 6 months (or 12 months for the social sciences and humanities), *or* by publication being on an immediate open access basis, incurring an APC to do so.

EU requirements also extend to ensuring that a metadata record is available, and recommend the adoption of unique identifiers wherever possible, for example ORCID or equivalent for individual contributors.

In the United States, building on a voluntary scheme established by the National Institute of Health in 2005, to make research it funded freely available via PubMed Central (PMC), in February 2013 the US Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP) directed all federal agencies making research grants totalling more than \$100m annually to introduce open access requirements. Applying only to papers published in peer-reviewed journals, reporting research results funded from such sources, OSTP stipulated that:

- The final, accepted manuscript must be submitted, on acceptance for publication, to the federal granting agency or a designated repository such as PMC, *and*
- made freely and openly available following an embargo period not exceeding 12 months, regardless of discipline.

As with the RCUK and EU requirements, if permitted by the publisher, the final published version may be substituted for the accepted manuscript.

Various UK medical research charities, including the Wellcome Trust and Cancer Research UK, have taken a slightly different approach, jointly establishing the Charities' Open Access Fund (COAF) in October 2014. Although each partner charity maintains its own open access policy, the common expectations are that papers arising from research funded by COAF members:

- Are made immediately and freely available, in final published form, on publication wherever possible, *and*

- Having been accepted for publication in a peer reviewed journal, are made available via PMC and Europe PMC, and monographs and book chapters via PMC Bookshelf and Europe PMC, as soon as possible and not more than six months after the official date of publication, *and*
- Are licenced for re-use with a CC-BY licence where an open access fee is paid by COAF (which is strongly encouraged in other cases).

For research funded by COAF members, therefore, open access requirements cannot be met solely by self-archiving in an institutional repository. However, COAF members expect the researchers they fund to maximise opportunities to make all their results accessible and available for free, including by taking advantage of institutional repositories.

Finally HEFCE, in March 2014, announced open access requirements for publications submitted to a future Research Excellence Framework (REF). Relaxed slightly in July 2015 to recognise the challenges faced by institutions in implementing their initial requirements, HEFCE requires:

- That the final, accepted version of journal articles and conference contributions, accepted for publication on or after 1 April 2016, should be deposited in an institutional or other repository as soon as possible after acceptance and not later than three months after the date of publication; journal articles and conference contributions accepted on or after 1 April 2018 should be deposited not later than three months after the date of acceptance; *and*
- That metadata describing the deposited output and allowing its discovery must be immediately available; *and*
- That the final, accepted version of the output itself should be made freely and openly available as soon as possible after deposit, allowing for embargos not exceeding 12 months (for REF Main Panels A and B, typically covering STEM subjects) or 24 months (for REF Main Panels C and D, typically covering social sciences and the arts and humanities) *and*
- That an appropriate licence for reuse has been applied. No specific licence is required, but the minimum acceptable is equivalent to a CC-BY-NC-ND licence.

HEFCE has also indicated that where institutions go beyond the basic requirements in enabling open access, additional credit will be given in the research environment section of the next REF.

Please note that this Appendix, although correct at the time of drafting, is only intended to provide a summary of the main funders' key requirements rather than comprehensive guidance, and should not be used as a substitute for referring to official documentation.

APPENDIX C: BRIEF FAQs ON OPEN ACCESS

What is Open Access? Open Access (OA) means making research freely accessible online for anyone to read. There are protections for researchers' rights.

Why is Open Access important? Idealistically, research is a public good and should be shared as widely and as openly as possible. OA is the best way to achieve this. More tangibly, OA is now a requirement for REF, grant funders etc. Failure to engage will have consequences, personally and institutionally.

What am I expected to do under the Policy on Open Access Publication of Research? Make your research outputs available through our institutional repository, ARRO. This involves providing metadata about your output, and usually a copy of the output itself.

What is ARRO? Anglia Ruskin Research Online (ARRO) is our institutional repository, for researchers based at Anglia Ruskin. Full-text outputs deposited within it are available on an open-access basis.

What types of research output need to be deposited in ARRO? All published and peer-reviewed research outputs, regardless of their type, should be deposited in ARRO, if practical to do so. If you cannot deposit the output itself, it will usually be possible to record its existence.

Requirements for the next REF only apply to journal articles, and conference contributions carrying an ISSN. However, we expect that a future REF will extend these requirements.

What version of my output should I deposit? You should deposit a full-text copy of the accepted version of the output. If the published version of record is available, and your publisher permits its deposit, this may be used instead. The pre-print is not acceptable.

When should I deposit my output in ARRO? If your output is a journal article, or conference contribution carrying an ISSN, you should deposit it on notification of acceptance from your publisher and not less than three months after this date. For all other output types, you should ensure that you deposit as soon as possible after publication.

How do I deposit my output in ARRO? Visit <http://arro.anglia.ac.uk/> and log in. Click the "New Item" button and follow through subsequent pages to attach a copy of your output, enter relevant metadata, select a licence for reuse, and give permission to use ARRO to share it. This process is as straightforward as possible. A similar deposit routine will shortly be available via Symplectic.

What is metadata? Metadata describes your research output, for example its title, publisher, date, keywords, and abstract. Usually it will also include a link to the published version.

What is a publisher's embargo? A publisher may require an embargo as a condition of publication. This is a prohibition on making your research output available via ARRO, or another repository, for a defined period after publication. During this time the only means of access is via the publisher's version.

What maximum embargo period applies to me? For STEM subjects the maximum embargo allowed by the REF is 12 months from date of publication. For non-STEM subjects the maximum embargo allowed by the REF is 24 months from date of publication.

What is the purpose of licensing my output? Licences set out the basis on which users can reuse and redistribute your work. Creative Commons have developed a series of licences, see <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/>. Ideally, we prefer use of the CC-BY licence.

Anglia's policy requires that your research output is licensed in terms not more restrictive than those of the CC-BY-NC-ND licence.

What is the difference between the Creative Commons licence and the ARRO licence?

The Creative Commons licence tells users how they can, and cannot, make use of your work. The ARRO licence gives us permission to share your work through ARRO.

What about copyright? When you make your output available via a repository you will do so under terms set by your journal or publisher. Of course, as with any publication you must not infringe third-party copyright: this may mean, for example, ensuring that images are removed from doctoral theses.

What happens if my research output cannot meet the requirements of the Policy on Open Access to Publications? Occasionally your outputs may not fully meet these requirements, for example if your publisher prohibits full text deposit in a repository, or requires an embargo period that exceeds the maximum for your discipline. You should ensure that as far as possible the requirements of the Policy are met and that the reason why your output does not meet all of them are recorded. We are developing systems to do this at present.

What are the consequences for me if my research outputs cannot meet the requirements of the Policy on Open Access to Publications? It is understood that there are reasons why your research outputs may not meet policy requirements. However if these reasons cannot be justified it is possible that you will not be submittable to the next REF, or be eligible to apply for external research grants in future. Our Staff Disciplinary Policy and Procedure may also be invoked if persistent publication in non-compliant outlets, or relying on recording why outputs cannot meet the Policy cannot be satisfactorily justified.

What is the difference between 'green' and 'gold' OA? Green OA means research outputs being made freely available in an open access repository such as ARRO, usually after an embargo. Gold OA involves paying a fee – the article processing charge (APC) – for the publisher themselves to make research outputs freely available on publication.

Does the author actually pay the APC? While an author can pay the APC personally, these charges are usually covered by external research grant funding, or institutional funds. We set up our OA Support Fund for this purpose in 2014.

How do I choose between 'gold' and 'green' open access? If you can choose between green and gold OA, you should consider the cost of paying for immediate OA, versus the delay in an output becoming available via an OA repository after an embargo period. You can seek advice from your Faculty Research lead.

Is there any help available? Anything you submit will be checked by the Library's ARRO team before it goes live. For help with ARRO and submitting outputs, contact Ian Walker, Research Services Manager, University Library – ian.walker@anglia.ac.uk. For help with REF, contact Tim Brooks, Head of Research Excellence & Enhancement, RIDO – tim.brooks@anglia.ac.uk.

PLEASE NOTE: these FAQs have been phrased for brevity. For fuller guidelines please see: <http://web.anglia.ac.uk/anet/rdcs/research/open/openaccessfaqs.phtml>