1. Project Overview

1.1 Project Summary

The HHuLO Access project will examine the role of open access in furthering the development of research at the partner institutions. The project will focus on good practice in identifying and implementing a range of open access initiatives across the partners with the specific remit of furthering the research interests of the partner institutions, and will work with Jisc Monitor, IRUS-UK and the BL in the areas of APC management, statistics and open access rights management. The use of in-house open access publication will also be explored. The project will showcase its work at an event halfway through the project period to gather community feedback and make the second year a more collaborative development to refine the good practice being disseminated. Further communication will take place through the Open Access Workflows for Academic Libraries (OAWAL) wiki and Jisc OAIC events. Work to enhance the established EPrints and Fedora repositories at the partner sites will be undertaken and fed back accordingly. All work will be undertaken within the context of an emerging and shifting open access policy context, which will be monitored to show the relationship with the good practice identified.
1.2 Aim

Open access (OA) as a form of research dissemination was, up until 2012, an option rather than a requirement. Research Councils and other funders encouraged its use, but this was not generally enforced. However, many researchers had taken advantage of open access through choice. The publication of the Finch Report in July 2012, and the emergence of funder open access policies since this, was a watershed moment in open access, adding a sense of requirement to the choice open access offers. Institutional systems and processes to address this requirement are developing, with many feeling uncertain of how to proceed. The introduction of open access requirements from funders has coincided with other open access developments. These need to be treated together so that good practice that is shared takes account of the whole context of research dissemination.

The use of gold open access is also making institutions look more seriously at how funds to support this are best managed and can best be exploited to serve the institution’s needs. The recently released HEFCE Policy for open access in the post-2014 Research Excellence Framework has confirmed that journal articles and many conference proceedings will need to be made available on open access to be eligible for submission. The HEFCE working group on open access monographs will also report in 2015: whilst not having an immediate effect on the REF policy it will impact on open access developments for a broader range of research outputs. Online and internal discussion on the HEFCE initiatives has already highlighted that they will have a profound effect on OA workflows for all active researchers. The policy itself is one of a number of OA initiatives, requiring researchers to be up-to-date on the implications and opportunities offered by potentially contrasting requirements.

The Universities of Hull, Huddersfield and Lincoln have been active in supporting open access for many years, both internally and through a variety of external projects. Each has played an active role in the development of their local repository, looking to exploit technology to further institutional open access services. All are institutions seeking to develop their research capability and reputation. Open access has a key role to play in supporting this mutual strategic direction. **The aim of this good practice project is thus to identify how open access support mechanisms can be used to assist with this development of research, working towards a more effective and rewarding submission to the post-2014 REF.** Working together, the three institutions will bring a wealth of experience and innovative thinking to capturing existing and novel good practice and sharing this, with the aim of supporting other institutions developing their research capacity and looking to understand how open access can be used as a means of supporting this.

In fulfilling these aims, the project will address the following areas from the proposal document:

- Compliance with funders’ and institutional mandates
- Monitoring and managing publication charges and licences
- Gathering information around block grant publication fund distribution
- Identifying, facilitating and managing interoperability across relevant IT services
- Improving awareness and clarity of research funders’ OA policy

The project partners will liaise collaboratively on all aspects of the project, and work with relevant external bodies as required. For example, existing arrangements and developments with Jisc Monitor and IRUS-UK will feed into the project’s case study outputs.

1.3 Objectives

The HHuLO Access project will have the following objectives.

WP1. To establish a baseline starting point
In order to both be effective as a project and to place a marker in the sand from the start, a combined baseline case study of OA activity at the three institutions will be developed. This will be disseminated externally as a ‘state-of-play’ report to inform similar institutions on what activity is taking place currently. The case study will also be used internally to provide a detailed assessment of current institutional research and OA activity and inform specific joint initiatives for the project.

WP2. To communicate the policy landscape
As described in paragraph 1.2, the policy landscape for OA has shifted dramatically in the past two years. The project will examine this landscape and create a workflow that enables all stakeholders to navigate through the OA requirements they need to take account of, including local as well as external
mandates. By simplifying this navigation the project will seek to enable the focus of attention to be around the benefits of open access as a component part of research dissemination overall.

WP3. To review and implement options for open access service development

Taking the baseline case study as a starting point the project will review OA services and workflows to best understand the implications of establishing and/or developing these for our institutions. The review will cover the financial management of OA and contrast this with OA services not directly involving related funding (i.e., gold vs. green). It will include currently offered services and workflows, plus explore novel ideas for new services and how these may be implemented. Institutional decisions will be taken on how to prioritise these, and the services/workflows implemented accordingly. The project will work with external bodies such as Jisc Monitor and IRUS-UK in this area, and with the British Library in regard of the management, declaration and exposure of OA rights, through services such as the Electronic Theses Online Service (EThOS). The output will be shared online for wider editing and comment to make the list more extensive.

WP4. To enhance local systems to serve OA needs

The HEFCE policy has made it clear that institutional repositories are a vital part of the mechanism by which it will be implemented. Already there have been widespread discussions on the implications of the policy, and awareness that technical enhancement to how repositories currently operate will be required to assist with this. The project partners will work with the EPrints and Hydra/Fedora developers and local IT support to understand and make the changes required. Such changes will be carried out acknowledging any other changes that may be beneficial and undertaken alongside.

WP5. To understand the relationship between OA and research development within the institution

This objective pulls together the developments in OA that are being taken forward and places them in context to answer the question, ‘What benefit does the institution get from OA?’. This will be undertaken through the gathering of feedback from academics making use of OA, and placed in the context of the OA policies being responded, to contrast the carrot and the stick of OA.

WP6. To report and reflect work to the community

All other objectives will produce outputs (see below) that can be used by the community more widely. The project is conceived as one that will address the majority of its objectives at an early stage, but then see through the implications of what comes of the work and report and reflect this back to the community through the project blog, the OA WAL wiki (https://library3.hud.ac.uk/blogs/oawal/), Jisc OAIC Good Practice events, a specific project event, and biannual updates to the case study created through the first objective.

1.4 Strategic Alignment

At the University of Hull, institutional mandate is currently limited to Doctoral and Masters by Research theses, with an institutional policy on research data management forthcoming that will mandate management of research data openly wherever possible (and be overseen by a Research Data Management Steering Group). Hull’s institutional strategy 2012-15 is to build the stature and reputation of the institution through developing its research capacity and profile, making sure that the outcomes of this research result in a tangible impact on the local and global community in which the University operates.

Currently the University of Huddersfield also only mandates doctoral thesis submission to the Repository. The metadata of research outputs is also mandated, however, there is ongoing discussion about funder mandates and possible University mandates through the newly created Research Data Management and Open Access Committee. The University’s new 2013-18 strategy map indicators a strong commitment to “undertake pioneering research”, for example, all academic staff are required to hold or be registered on a doctoral programme, 60% of academic staff must publish at an ‘international’ level and the university will achieve and maintain a PGR community of 1000+ FTE.

The University of Lincoln views research as critical to its mission, and is committed to growth in research capacity and performance to support transformational change in society. This includes a “Student as Producer” ethos which actively involves undergraduates in world-leading research projects. From 2011-13, Lincoln undertook the JISC-funded ‘Orbital’ project, which began by looking at innovation in Research Data Management but widened its scope to produce an institution-wide strategy for Research Information Management (encompassing research data, Open Access publishing and deposit, and business information & processes to support research).
All good practice identified and put into practice will take the wider HE policy context into account. It is likely that this policy landscape will further evolve over the period of the project, and funder policies will need to be managed in the context of the HEFCE OA policy, ensuring that all can be leveraged toward successful OA dissemination for the benefit of the researcher, institution and post-REF 2014.

### 1.5 Anticipated Outputs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Output (e.g. report, publication, software, knowledge built)</th>
<th>Brief Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseline case study (Sep 2014)</td>
<td>Starting point review of current OA offering at the three partner institutions, to provide a ‘state-of-play’ starting point to inform direction and enable later evaluation. An appendix will address the link between OA and research development, adding data through subsequent iterations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OA policy landscape workflow (Oct 2014)</td>
<td>A tool to aid navigation of the OA policy landscape, to inform the project and others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service and workflow review (Nov 2014)</td>
<td>Information gathering and innovative development of OA services and workflows, building on current practice and highlighting for wider awareness of options, in particular in relation to how OA can support research development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OA policy technical enhancements (Jul 2015, though may extend beyond, depending on requirements and innovation required)</td>
<td>Adaptations and improvements will be made to EPrints and Hydra/Fedora repository software systems, and fed back to the open source communities making use of these technologies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications (Throughout, looking to make additions weekly in some way)</td>
<td>A project blog, contributions to the OAWAL wiki, project event centred on OA and research development. Active participation in OAIC events as appropriate. Hashtag #hhuloa to be used in all communications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case study iterations (Mar 2015, Sep 2015, Mar 2016)</td>
<td>Biannual iterations of the case study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project event (tentatively scheduled for April 2015)</td>
<td>A project dissemination event timed to communicate the outputs from the initial areas of work and get feed back from the community prior to putting them into practice. An opportunity also to identify how the community can provide ongoing feedback in the second year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publication/conference output (April 2016)</td>
<td>The case study will be written up for publication in an appropriate, open access, journal, and disseminated through a relevant conference (aiming at UKSG 2016). Both communications to be toward the end of the project period to capture all learning and good practice.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1.6 Overall Approach

The project will be undertaken through a combination of collaborative planning, knowledge gathering, development of innovative solutions, and communication, and individual institutional implementation, practice and feedback. Through this we envisage the individual experiences of open access practice being enriched through combination, highlighting the contrasting experiences that different institutions have and maximising the value to the community through shared dissemination.

The project will be undertaken using the following methodology:

- Meetings every two weeks, either face-to-face or virtual as required, with a minimum of a face-to-face meeting every four months. This schedule will maintain regular project communication, facilitating the sharing of information and providing a forum to gain feedback on local developments as the project progresses. Email will be used between meetings.
- Clearly assign responsibilities and a timeframe for each area of work, and a reporting schedule to help progress the work within its timeframe.
- Equal participation by project partners in Jisc OAIC events, making sure that all partners get fair representation and report back to anyone who cannot attend.
The scope of this work will be the development of open access services to best support the implementation of research strategy at institutions looking to develop their research capacity and reputation. It will include within this consideration of green and gold open access, plus novel means of open access such as in-house publication. It will not address open access to research data per se, except where there is a direct connection to open dissemination of the publication. Other than exploring measures to assess impact of publications disseminated via open access, the project will also not cover any assessment of institutional publication overall and reporting of this, focusing instead on the dissemination itself and how this benefits research development.

### 1.7 Timetable and Budget outline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Q2/14</th>
<th>Q3/14</th>
<th>Q4/14</th>
<th>Q1/15</th>
<th>Q2/15</th>
<th>Q3/15</th>
<th>Q4/15</th>
<th>Q1/16</th>
<th>Costs</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WP1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1.8 Measuring Success

The project will take the following as its success factors:

- Dissemination of the case study to inform institutional OA development, success being measured by the tabling of the case study at relevant University Committees, and new actions stemming from it with each iteration.
- Sharing of the OA policy landscape workflow and measurement of interest through statistics.
- Sharing of the service review and measurement of interest through repository download statistics and interaction with the online editable version.
- Associated additions to the OAWAL wiki in the context of project contributions.
- Repository enhancements made and disseminated back to the respective communities; these enhancements picked up and used elsewhere.

### 1.8 Critical success factors

Critical to the success of the project will be:

- The gathering of evidence to inform the link between OA and research development, so that the purpose of OA can be clearly defined as part of ongoing research strategy.
- Maintenance of the OA policy landscape as changes occur, otherwise it loses its value.
- The enhancements to the repository systems, without which it will be difficult to effectively implement relevant OA workflows.

### 2 Project Resources

#### 2.1 Associate HEI Partners

The University of Hull has a number of key research strengths, and is at the cusp of expanding this through major investment in key strategic areas. In this context, Hull is ideally positioned to lead a pathfinder project to track and capture how open access can support this research investment and growth, contrasting this with experience at the associate universities. Hull has been active in the development of repositories since 2005 (leading the Jisc RepoMMan, REMAP, CLIF and Hydrangea projects). Hull is also a founding Partner in the international Hydra repository project. Library and Learning Innovation leads on open access advocacy and support for the University, overseeing RCUK fund allocation, open access fund arrangements with publishers, and advising on research dissemination strategy. Chris Awre, Head of Information Management – c.awre@hull.ac.uk

The University of Huddersfield’s vision is to be an inspiring, innovative University of international renown: a key element of this is to undertake pioneering research and to significantly grow the
universities research income. Established in 2007, the institutional repository now contains nearly 17,000 items. 52% of items published since 2008 are available in full text and the Repository expects its 1,000,000th download in 2014. Huddersfield was a member of the PIRUS2 project and an IRUS-UK ‘pioneer repository’ (http://eprints.hud.ac.uk/15105/). In the wider context of open access publishing, Huddersfield launched HOAP, an open access journals platform, in 2011 as part of a Jisc funded project. HOAP is now part of the library-managed University of Huddersfield Press, which also publishes open access monographs. Both routes to open access are managed by the Library’s Information Resources Team in close partnership with the Research and Enterprise Directorate. Graham Stone, Information Resources Manager – g.stone@hud.ac.uk

The University of Lincoln views research as critical to its mission, and is committed to growth in research capacity and performance to support transformational change in society. This includes a “Student as Producer” ethos which actively involves undergraduates in world-leading research projects. Lincoln’s Open Access Repository was established in 2004, and a mandate for bibliographic deposit agreed in 2010. From 2011-13, Lincoln undertook the JISC-funded ‘Orbital’ project, which began by looking at innovation in Research Data Management but widened its scope to produce an institution-wide strategy for Research Information Management (encompassing research data, Open Access publishing and deposit, and business information & processes to support research). Paul Stainthorp, Electronic Resources Librarian – pstainthorp@lincoln.ac.uk

2.2 Project Management

The project will be led and managed by the University of Hull, which will work in partnership with the Universities of Huddersfield and Lincoln. Chris Awre will act as Project Manager and report to the Project Director, Richard Heseltine, who will have overall responsibility for the project’s work and deliverables. Graham Stone and Paul Stainthorp will act as Project Associates, working with and reporting to Chris Awre on the objectives of the work. All three partner institutions will involve other members of staff as appropriate where they can bring their expertise and knowledge to the project’s activity. Deliverables will be distributed amongst the project partners, and overseen by Hull to ensure they meet the expectations and objectives of the project. Decisions will be shared, with Hull taking final responsibility as lead on the project.

2.3 Project Roles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team Member Name</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Contact Details</th>
<th>Days per week to be spent on the project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Richard Heseltine</td>
<td>Project Director</td>
<td><a href="mailto:r.g.heseltine@hull.ac.uk">r.g.heseltine@hull.ac.uk</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Awre</td>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td><a href="mailto:c.awre@hull.ac.uk">c.awre@hull.ac.uk</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graham Stone</td>
<td>Associate</td>
<td><a href="mailto:g.stone@hud.ac.uk">g.stone@hud.ac.uk</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Stainthorp</td>
<td>Associate</td>
<td><a href="mailto:pstainthorp@lincoln.ac.uk">pstainthorp@lincoln.ac.uk</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.4 Training

No specific training needs have been identified.

2.5 Communications, Dissemination and Events

The project will make use of a number of channels of communication throughout the project.

- A project blog – HHuLOA there! – for regular updates on project partner activity
- The OAWAL wiki – an initiative launched in March 2014 by Jill Emery (Portland State University) and Graham Stone (University of Huddersfield), which encouraged the crowdsourcing of best practice and OA workflows
- Jisc OAIC events, as scheduled, which will be used to disseminate specific aspects of the work, highlighting key findings that are unique to the project’s work.
- A project event at the University of Hull. This is tentatively planned for April 2015, and will be used to both disseminate and validate the work carried out to that date, showcase the first iteration of the case study, and gather feedback to identify gaps and the direction the project can most usefully take for the remainder of its time to serve the needs of the community.
- An article discussing the findings and final outputs of the project in a peer reviewed OA library journal such as Insights, Evidence Based Library and Information Practice or Journal of Librarianship and Scholarly Communication