**Introduction**

- Funding bodies’ proposals for open access in a post-2014 REF
- Join the conversation at #OAREF

**Some benefits of open access**

- Wider and smarter access to more information for research community
- Increased visibility, usage and impact for researchers and institutions
- Increased economic and social impact of public funding
Some issues...

- Embargo periods
- Learned Societies and Subject Associations
- Monographs
- Licensing
- Academic freedom

2010: estimated **25,400 journals** in STEM alone
2009: 1.5 million articles published
one every 20 minutes

*Volume is part of the problem*
Policy proposals

Definition
Outputs submitted to a post-2014 REF should be open access.

Exceptions

Criteria

Criteria: what do we mean by open access?

- Accessible through a UK HEI repository, immediately upon either acceptance or publication
- Available as the final peer-reviewed text

Criteria: what do we mean by open access?

- Embargo periods to be respected by the repository
- REF panel will follow embargo period set by the appropriate Research Council

Criteria: what do we mean by open access?

- Allows search and re-use of content (including downloading and text-mining)
- Manual and automated re-use
- Subject to proper attribution under appropriate licensing
Criteria: points for consultation

- Appropriateness of criteria?
- Role for institutional repositories?
- Acceptance or publication?
- Embargo periods varying by REF panel?
- Licensing requirements?

Definition: which outputs will need to meet the criteria?

- Journal articles or conference proceedings only
- Published after a two year notice period (i.e. 2016)
- UK HEI in address field

Exceptions: how should we treat exceptions?

- On a case-by-case basis
  OR
- A percentage approach to compliance
  ▪ Consistent across all outputs, or
  ▪ Varying by main panel

Exceptions: a percentage approach to compliance

- Consistent target across all outputs within scope (70%)
- Vary by REF main panel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main panel</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage target for compliance</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary

- RCUK OA Policy and transitional flexibility.
- Monitoring compliance and costs.
- Differential pricing.

Why are we doing this?

- Research outputs must be accessible to enable exploitation.
- Research funders have a responsibility to ensure accessibility.
- Dissemination is part of the research process and has to be paid for.
- Journals, libraries, repositories & publishers have a key role to play in the process.

Get the stuff out there and get it used!
RCUK Policy on Open Access

• Definitions.
• Scope.
• RCUK’s expectations of:
  – Researchers;
  – Journals;
  – Research Institutions.
• Implementation and compliance.

RCUK definition of ‘Open Access’

Unrestricted, on-line access to peer reviewed and published scholarly research papers.

Specifically a user must be able to do the following free of any publisher-imposed access charge:
1. Read published research papers in an electronic format.
2. Search for and re-use (including download) the content.

Allows unrestricted use of manual and automated text and data mining tools, as well as unrestricted re-use of content with proper attribution (as defined by CC-BY).

Scope

• Peer - reviewed research articles.
• Published in journals or conference proceedings.
• Acknowledging RCUK funding.
• Submitted for publication from April 2013.
• “Accepted for publication”.

Expectations: Researchers

• Publish in RCUK Open Access compliant journal.
• Include RC funding acknowledgement: RIN guidance.
• Where relevant, include statement on accessing underlying research materials.
Expectations: Journals

- Journal either provides:
  - Immediate, unrestricted access to final version on its website
  - Using CC-BY licence
  - Immediate deposit in other repositories
  - No restriction on re-use
- Or consents to:
  - Deposit of final accepted MS in any repository
  - No restriction on commercial re-use
  - Within defined period

Expectations: Institutions

- Institutions receiving RCUK OA block grants to:
  - Establish institutional publication funds;
  - Develop processes to manage and allocate funds transparently and fairly between disciplines and researchers.
  - RCUK expects the primary use to be payments of APCs.
  - RCUK preference is gold OA, but decision lies with authors and institutions.

Implementation

- Five year transition period.
- Compliance – year one 45%, year two 53%.
- Aiming for 75% gold OA by 2018, and 100% compliance with policy.
- Flexibility in embargo periods (12/24).
- First evidence-based review Q4 2014.

2014 Review: Scope

- International landscape.
- Impact of policy on:
  - Disciplines;
  - Peer review;
  - Research collaboration.
- Impact of licences.
- Embargo periods.
- Overall costs.
- Block grants and costs of managing them.
2014 Review: Schedule

- Review panel being constituted.
- Call for evidence – planned for Q2 2014:
  - Invitations to key stakeholders to submit evidence;
  - Plus general ‘open’ call for evidence.
- Review panel to consider evidence – Q4 2014.
- Confirmed schedule will be widely publicised.

2014 Review: Compliance monitoring

- Has the RCUK policy made a difference?
- How much RCUK funded research is:
  - Published?
  - Gold with CC BY?
  - Green?
  - Non-compliant?
- Account for how ‘block grant’ has been spent, on a per-publisher basis.

Compliance analysis

- By institution and by Research Council:
  - ‘Year 1’: April 2013 to July 2014;
  - Then on an academic year basis.

- RCUK analysis will be based on sub-set of papers reported via ROS and ResearchFish:
  - Aim to include a ‘Year 0’ baseline (April 2010 to July 2011).

2014 Review: Evidence
2014 Review: Evidence

Section A – ‘Expenditure by Publisher’

To include all spend connected with publishing individual articles, i.e. APCs, page charges, colour charges, etc.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publisher</th>
<th>£-</th>
<th>Number of articles published as a result of this spend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Publisher A</td>
<td>£-</td>
<td>Number of articles published as a result of this spend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publisher B</td>
<td>£-</td>
<td>Number of articles published as a result of this spend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publisher C</td>
<td>£-</td>
<td>Number of articles published as a result of this spend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publisher D</td>
<td>£-</td>
<td>Number of articles published as a result of this spend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>etc...</td>
<td>(add rows as necessary)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section B

Other expenditure analysis

| Other Expenditure to achieve OA – 1 | £- | Brief description (500 characters, incl punctuation and spaces) of activity funded |
| Other Expenditure to achieve OA – 2 | £- | Brief description (500 characters, incl punctuation and spaces) of activity funded |
| Other Expenditure to achieve OA – 3 | £- | Brief description (500 characters, incl punctuation and spaces) of activity funded |
| etc... | (add rows as necessary) |

Sub-total paid to publishers | £- |

Sub-total of other expenditure | £- |

If balance is negative, a brief description (500 characters incl punctuation and spaces) of source funds used in addition to RCUK block grant | £- |

Balance of block grant remaining | £- |

Monitoring: working in partnership

- Identify with Research Organisations:
  - Minimum achievable level of reporting;
  - Data gathering mechanisms.
- RIN ‘HEI Best Practice Project’:
  - Cooperative framework for monitoring progress towards OA;
  - Working Group established.

Differential pricing

- Gold OA:
  - RCUK preference for immediate, unrestricted access to the ‘article of record’;
  - Publishers’ preference as sustainable and scalable in an OA world.
- BUT transition costs are disproportionately falling on research funders and research institutions.
- If publishers want Gold to succeed, they need to support the costs of transition.
- Journal subscriptions at an institutional level must reflect additional APC payments.
Further information

- RCUK Policy
  http://www.rcuk.ac.uk/research/Pages/outputs.aspx
- RCUK Blogs
  http://blogs.rcuk.ac.uk
- Finch Group report
- Royal Society Report

openaccess@rcuk.ac.uk
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1. Strategy

- UCL OA strategy at http://www.ucl.ac.uk/library/open-access/

- Cost of APCs should not be a barrier to OA publication

- Monies from
  - UCL Research budget
  - RCUK, Wellcome, ERC

- UCL has OA mandate at http://www.ucl.ac.uk/library/publications-policy.shtml

2. Partnerships

3. Disciplinary differences

4. Conclusions?

**UCL Discovery**

Downloads from UCL Discovery

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Q2</th>
<th>Q3</th>
<th>Q4</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>334,159</td>
<td>343,262</td>
<td>320,162</td>
<td>227,753</td>
<td>1,225,336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>213,402</td>
<td>245,836</td>
<td>229,864</td>
<td>349,688</td>
<td>1,038,790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>146,748</td>
<td>155,152</td>
<td>107,601</td>
<td>175,464</td>
<td>584,965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>117,514</td>
<td>133,024</td>
<td>128,924</td>
<td>146,690</td>
<td>526,114</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LERU OA Legal Portal**

- LERU has 21 research intensive universities as members in Europe – see http://www.leru.org

- Portal would be built by TEL (The European Library)

- All LERU OA legal publications brought together into one interface

- Value-Added Services, such as Text and Data Mining, also possible
Benefits of Partnership working

- Portal builds on shared values - collegiality, research and knowledge creation as a shared endeavour, expressed in LERU Roadmap Towards Open Access.
- Costs shared amongst members.
- Creation of a value-added product amongst a subject community with strong ties.

The LERU Roadmap towards Open Access


Plaster Relief by John Flaxman, Flaxman Gallery, UCL

The view from Arts and Humanities?

Not So Fast on 'Open Access'

September 24, 2012
by Scott Jaschik

The movement toward “open access” publishing -- in which scholarly journal articles are available free -- as taking off without consideration of the impact on humanities scholarship, says a statement being released today by the American Historical Association.

Much of the statement questions the logic of the “Mitch Report,” released in Boston and endorsed by the government there, which calls on all journals to shift to open access. Those recommendations go well beyond the push in the U.S. to require open access for federally supported research. The historians’ statement particularly takes issue with the Mitch Report recommendation that one way to phase out subscriptions would be to charge authors (or their institutions) a publication fee.

Monograph Publishing

- Is Open Access a solution to broken Business Model?
- University Press takes on role as monograph publisher.
- Long-form monographs, peer reviewed.
- Short monographs in AHSS – new publishing format?
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Shared European infrastructure for monographs?

- 19 European partners, led by UCL
- European universities can become publishers themselves
- Shared publishing infrastructure with Open Access business models
- Research monographs in the Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences
- OAPEN to provide much of the technical infrastructure
- To be launched at UCL in December 2013

What could be achieved?

- Shared publishing infrastructure
  - Shared by 19 partners
  - Scaleable to all European Universities
- Advocacy for new solutions to solve monograph crisis
- Marketing frameworks
- Business Modelling activities
- At least 180 OA monographs in 35 series

Indicative series in European collaboration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Series titles proposed in total</th>
<th>Subject area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Media History and Film Theory</td>
<td>Media studies, Film theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spirituality Studies in Theology</td>
<td>Theology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Oral Literature Series</td>
<td>Literary Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iranian Studies</td>
<td>Middle Eastern Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law, Governance and Development Research</td>
<td>Law, International Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdisciplinary Issues - Art, City, Society</td>
<td>Urban Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Ideas in Human Interaction</td>
<td>Linguistics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>