HHuLOA project event, 25th June

Notes from exercises

A. Open Access lifecycle feedback

Re: models and mandates, there was a question of resilience and continuity of these, and how we ensure they are stable going forward (not a lifecycle issue per se, unless there is an element of periodic checking of these)

At a local level, school/departmental policies on open access roles and priorities need to be recognised. Is this additional to models and mandates, or part of them?

It was commented that open access is having a disproportionate impact on smaller institutions

The question was asked about what the minimal version would be of the lifecycle that would still enable policy compliance.

What components of the lifecycle contribute to RIOXX compliance?

There was a desire to highlight or capture better the workflow between institutional elements that may exist. This could be the basis of a local exercise to prompt discussion. Could the lifecycle somehow suggest or reflect this?

It was suggested that the position of library subscriptions and associated offset APC discounts should be included, as this is an area now very closely linked to open access. The suggestion was made of adding this across the top right hand corner, alongside Discovery, as such subscriptions are part of our discovery, and have an impact on subsequent open access choices. They could arguably also be referenced in the bottom left hand corner, where OA payment decisions will be impacted by offset arrangements in place.

It was noted that the link between submission and acceptance is fuzzy in practice.

The Publisher Finance System could also be listed in the right hand section (Publish -> Read/Use), although the reasoning for this was not indicated.

It was proposed that the lifecycle was a perfect template for an interactive tool at an institutional level. Again, no suggestion of how this could be enabled was indicated, but it could be that a blank template is provided with the elements for institutions to apply as they see fit to help define their local workflow.
B. Open access themes

**Financial – How can we assess funding in open access as an investment?**

OA can enable potential collaboration with other HEIs for greater mutual visibility and economic benefits

Funding body returns vs. unit costs

Potential savings through reductions in subscriptions

REF success through good environmental score

Potentially useful as a recruitment tool for staff and students in highlighting work undertaken at the University

**Measurement of citations**

Mapping download hits to look for geographical collaboration opportunities

Investment in the University’s reputation through marketing opportunities

**Legal – How can we use licensing to control/manage open dissemination?**

Where do we get rights from (as in who has the right to issue rights)?

Use Creative Commons licensing

Follow funder, faculty, university policies on licensing

Negotiate with publishers on use of relevant open licensing to protect assets

Use open access as a catalyst for academics and institutions to address IPR issues in institutional assets and outputs

**Functional (dissemination) – How is research dissemination functionally put into practice?**

Within institutions – left to individual researchers? Whose role is it within an institution?

Could a library produce a list of desirable journals? Is this itself desirable?

Conversations around appropriate places for publication. How and where do these conversations take place?
The issue is bound up with journal rating / measurement and citation measurement.

There are disciplinary differences in how dissemination is managed – some degree of cultural engagement is thus required.

Put articles in repositories (as many as possible). Also mention in blogs, tweets, kudos, and use the altmetric doughnut for repository entries.

Curate a relationship with internal marketing.

Link impact case studies (REF-related or other) to publications, in the repository or elsewhere.

Cover open access availability in public seminars.

Establish a Journal Club to foster interchange of views about articles and where/how they are being disseminated.

**Technical – What is the repository’s role within the institution?**

This should also cover the role of the CRIS within the institution.

Technology use as a means of ensuring compliance and monitoring.

To capture a complete record of publications, or storing all the things produced.

A tool for supplying a list to HEFCE for eligibility, as well as determining eligibility.

Where does the date of acceptance go? CRIS or repository, or both?

A tool for showcasing research, or providing an example of good governance.

A tool through which DOIs can be assigned to the materials held, of various types (working papers, theses, date, etc.).

**Staffing – What staff resource is needed to make OA effective for the institutional investment in OA?**

Faculty contacts.

Designated specialists (vs. embedded support).

What levels of support are needed and where within an institution?

Needs focus, but also needs to be part of the library’s/institution’s core business.
Different stakeholders: Departments, IT, Research Office

Discipline-specific expertise

OA “champions”

University/faculty buy-in – linked to professional expectations

IT support – interrelated systems

Training / awareness-raising

Are OA related skills relevant to University recruitment generally? Also knowledge and/or experience of using Creative Commons licensing

**Community – How does the institution wish to be seen in the community re: OA?**

Reputation, compliance, research impact, commercial exploitation, knowledge transfer, value for money, public good, recruitment knock-on
C. Research strategy feedback

Scenario 3 might seem most realistic for a small institution. Conservative approach would make it impossible to get other things like RDM, citation, profiles, on the agenda. There is a serious risk of lack of collaboration opportunities – and associated research income.

Not much of a difference between 1+2 (both recognise value when 3 does not), except language and sunny optimism! Scenario 1 might be attractive for an aspirational small university, but it would be difficult to sustain and come with the danger of a crash. Scenario 2 looks more sustainable.

This feels more about culture change than strategy. Make good practice the aim.

Academic freedom is difficult to reconcile with over strong strategy.

Make repository use part of the strategic plan/implementation.

There is a difference between outcomes/impact and outputs/publications. OA advocacy tied to the latter, not so much the former!!!

How realistic any scenario is will depend a lot on where your institution is now.

Does the Harvard declaration make a difference in looking to these scenarios?

If you were going to achieve Scenario 1, Open Access practice would have to be embedded within the measurement of performance in every Department. Would this undermine or add to competitiveness (difficult to recruit staff if other universities offer less prescriptive approach, but presentation of open approach may attract similarly-minded staff).

Some have already seen a change in talking to PhD students.