ARMA OPEN ACCESS PROBLEM SOLVING WORKSHOP 11th 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
• It's good – researchers don't need to cost in grants.
• It's 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.
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