

## Managing the Transition to Open Access

---

### A Helpsheet for UK Higher Education Institutions

This helpsheet is designed to assist UK Higher Education institutions in managing the transition to open access publishing. It consists of a series of questions that individuals with responsibility for the management and administration of open access may find it helpful to consider. These have been grouped into the following areas:

- Governance
- Institutional policies and guidance
- Communication
- Institutional repository
- Resourcing requirements
- Financial management and control
- Management information and compliance monitoring

In many cases there will be no 'right' answer to the questions, and institutional responses will vary depending on factors such as institutional size and scale, and the degree of centralisation in the management of open access.

Links to further resources that may be of value to institutions in developing their approach to open access can be found at the end of the document.

### About Research Consulting

Research Consulting provides consultancy services to organisations involved in the delivery, management and dissemination of research. We can help academic institutions, publishers and intermediaries develop new ways of working that are fit for the rapidly changing environment of open access publishing.

For more information about our services, or to provide feedback or suggestions on how this helpsheet could be improved, please visit our website, [www.researchconsulting.co.uk](http://www.researchconsulting.co.uk), or e-mail us at [enquiries@researchconsulting.co.uk](mailto:enquiries@researchconsulting.co.uk). We would be happy to provide a Word version of this document to facilitate completion by individual institutions on request.

|  | Yes | No | N/A | Comments |
|--|-----|----|-----|----------|
| <b>Governance</b>  |     |    |     |          |
| Is the institution's approach to open access supported and endorsed at a senior level, eg by the Pro Vice Chancellor for Research and/or the institutional Research Committee? |     |    |     |          |
| Does the institution have a working group or committee to oversee operational implementation of open access?   |     |    |     |          |
| Does the group include representatives from all relevant stakeholders, for example libraries, research support office and finance?   |     |    |     |          |
| Are the actions required to effectively manage the transition to open access publishing reflected in a project plan or similar document?                                       |     |    |     |          |
| Have the respective responsibilities of your library and research support functions for open access been clearly defined and agreed?   |     |    |     |          |
| Is there regular reporting to relevant working groups or committees on progress against the agreed plan?   |     |    |     |          |
| <b>Policies and guidance</b>   |     |    |     |          |
| Does your university have an institutional policy for Open Access?   |     |    |     |          |
| Has development and endorsement of the policy been led or overseen by academic staff?  |     |    |     |          |
| Has the policy been approved at an appropriate level within the institution (eg Research Committee or equivalent)?   |     |    |     |          |
| Has the policy been reviewed and if necessary revised to take account of recent developments in open access?   |     |    |     |          |
| Does the policy address the following:   |     |    |     |          |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Requirements/policy on deposition of articles in an</li> </ul>  |     |    |     |          |

|   |  |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|--|
| <p>institutional open access repository.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The version of an article that should be deposited.</li> <li>• The timing for deposit of articles (typically either at the point of acceptance for publication, or the date of publication).</li> <li>• Scope of the policy (eg articles and conference proceedings).</li> <li>• Institutional preference for green<sup>1</sup> or gold<sup>2</sup> open access.</li> <li>• Approach to compliance with funder open access mandates.</li> <li>• Eligibility criteria for funding of gold open access, where applicable.</li> <li>• Licensing policies to be applied where the University funds APC charges (if applicable).</li> <li>• Date from which the policy came into effect, including the institution's approach to retrospective publication in open access form.</li> </ul> |  |  |  |  |
| <p>Have you considered how your institutional policy will apply to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Research publications with multiple funding sources (eg RCUK and Wellcome Trust).</li> <li>• Research publications with co-authors from multiple institutions (you may wish to consider different policies for co-authorship with other UK institutions and overseas co-authors).</li> <li>• Publications by postgraduate students, with or without academic co-authorship.</li> </ul>   |  |  |  |  |

<sup>1</sup> 'Green' open access means the author is not required to pay a fee for an article. Under this model, authors will employ traditional channels to publish in a journal and then self-archive a version of the article for use in a subject or institutional repository. Typically, embargo periods imposed by the publisher will prevent archive of the final published version of the article for a given period of time.

<sup>2</sup> 'Gold' open access means the author is required to pay an APC (article processing charge) in order for an article to be published, thereby making it open access immediately.

|   |  |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Publications by emeritus professors or other associates of the University.</li> </ul>  |  |  |  |  |
| <p>Have you developed implementation guidelines and/or frequently asked questions to explain how the policy applies in practice?</p> <p>Do these cover:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The billing details authors may need to supply to publishers?</li> <li>Guidance on VAT arrangements on APCs, including the institution's VAT number?</li> <li>Whether authors require pre-approval from the institution before committing to payment of APC?</li> <li>Whether a purchase order is required to arrange payment of an APC?</li> <li>Details of any institutional prepayment or membership schemes with publishers?</li> <li>Guidance or links to the open access policies of major funders for your institution?</li> <li>How and when to use the Funders and Authors Compliance Tool (<a href="#">FACT</a>)?</li> </ul> |  |  |  |  |
| <p>Does your guidance alert academics and researchers to the risk of predatory/bogus journals and publishers?</p>   |  |  |  |  |
| <p>Have you considered how to manage the risk that demand for open access funding exceeds the funds available (whether from external or internal sources)?</p> <p>Some potential approaches to this may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Funds are made available on a first come, first served basis, thereafter authors must follow the green route.</li> <li>Access to funding is limited to publication in journals with a specified impact factor (or selected based on other discipline-specific criteria)</li> <li>Approval is required by Head of School/Academic Department for gold route open access.</li> </ul>  |  |  |  |  |

|   |  |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The number of articles that can be funded per year is capped at the level of organisational units, research groups or individual authors.</li> <li>• Devolution of a fixed allocation of funds to Schools/Departments/Faculties for local decision-making and administration.</li> </ul> |  |  |  |  |
| <b>Communication</b>  |  |  |  |  |
| Are your institutional policies and procedures freely available on your University website or intranet?   |  |  |  |  |
| Have you developed flowcharts or other user-friendly materials to guide authors through the process of making an article open access?   |  |  |  |  |
| Do you have a single point of contact for open access queries (eg a dedicated e-mail address)?  |  |  |  |  |
| Have you identified members of your academic staff who are already active in open access publishing, either as authors or editors? Have you drawn on them for advocacy/case study purposes, and/or in formulating your institutional policies?  |  |  |  |  |
| <p>Have you considered how funder and institutional policies may be interpreted within different disciplinary areas of your institution?</p> <p>For example, there are often particular concerns over licensing options and length of embargo periods in the arts, humanities and social sciences.</p>                            |  |  |  |  |
| Have you offered workshops or briefing sessions to make your academics and researchers aware of their obligations under funder and institutional policies?  |  |  |  |  |
| Does your institution's training provision for postgraduate students and early career researchers include sessions on open access publishing and licensing options?   |  |  |  |  |
| Have you developed marketing/promotional literature that can be used to raise awareness of open access, eg for distribution in libraries or at briefing events?   |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| Have you provided training to library and research office staff on the funder and institutional policies, and the local processes required to comply with these?   |  |  |  |  |
| <b>Institutional repository<sup>3</sup></b>  |  |  |  |  |
| Is your repository integrated with other institutional systems to facilitate deposition and re-use of data?<br><br>If not do you have plans to develop integration in this form?   |  |  |  |  |
| Does your repository allow you to associate outputs with research grants or projects?<br><br>If not have you considered the implications of the RIOXX metadata application profile for your repository, and the need to begin collecting project and funder data against new deposits?   |  |  |  |  |
| Are you fully aware and up-to-date with available repository enhancements (eg <a href="#">SWORD endpoint</a> availability, <a href="#">IRUS-UK</a> , <a href="#">OpenAIRE</a> compliance, <a href="#">KeepIt!</a> preservation feature or <a href="#">CRIS</a> plugins)?   |  |  |  |  |
| Have you considered what licensing requirements should be applied to material made available in your institutional repository?   |  |  |  |  |
| <b>Resourcing requirements</b>   |  |  |  |  |
| Have you considered the additional administrative burden entailed by open access, and any implications this may have for resourcing levels?<br><br>For example, additional resourcing needs may arise from: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Processing and approval of APC charges.</li> <li>• Liaison with authors and publishers to resolve payment queries.</li> <li>• Establishment and monitoring of prepayment and membership schemes with publishers.</li> </ul> |  |  |  |  |

<sup>3</sup> This section provides only some high level pointers on repository management. For more detailed good practice guidance readers are advised to refer to the JISC-funded Repositories Support Project, <http://www.rsp.ac.uk/>.

|   |  |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Checking on licensing terms and embargo periods for submissions to the institutional repository.</li> <li>• Set up and maintenance of new administrative processes.</li> <li>• Technical support for the institutional repository.</li> <li>• Development of on-line guidance and materials.</li> <li>• Preparation of reports for internal governance and management purposes.</li> <li>• Monitoring expenditure against externally funded block grants for open access.</li> <li>• Monitoring compliance with external funders' requirements.</li> </ul> |  |  |  |  |
| Has funding been identified to support any additional resourcing needs identified? Have you considered whether funds from external sources (eg RCUK block grants) can be used for this purpose?   |  |  |  |  |
| Where appropriate, have role profiles or person specifications been prepared or revised to reflect individuals' responsibilities in the area of Open Access management?   |  |  |  |  |
| <b>Financial management and control</b>   |  |  |  |  |
| Have you established a central fund for payment of APCs?  |  |  |  |  |
| Do you have a clear process or form by which academics can request/access funding for APCs?   |  |  |  |  |
| Have you considered whether page charges and other publication costs can be met from the same funding sources as APCs?  |  |  |  |  |
| Have you developed mechanisms to identify APCs funded from institutional sources that can in fact be recovered from funders (eg those associated with publications supported by RCUK, Wellcome Trust, British Heart Foundation)?  |  |  |  |  |
| Have you put in place prepayment or membership schemes for those publishers with whom your institution publishes a high volume of articles?   |  |  |  |  |
| Does your institutional financial system allow expenditure on article processing charges (APCs) to be   |  |  |  |  |

|   |  |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|--|
| separately identified and reported, eg by means of a dedicated account code?  |  |  |  |  |
| Have you/your finance department developed an accounting procedure for the management of prepayment accounts? <sup>4</sup>  |  |  |  |  |
| Have you put in place appropriate controls to limit the risk of unauthorised access to institutional prepayment accounts, eg an approval code?  |  |  |  |  |
| Are academics encouraged to cost OA publication charges into grant applications where permissible (eg for applications to the National Institute for Health Research and the European Commission)?            |  |  |  |  |
| Have you considered (or adopted) the use of an intermediary for management of your APCs?  |  |  |  |  |
| Where an APC is paid, have you considered who is responsible for checking the article has indeed been made open access? Is this the responsibility of the author, or the administrator approving the payment? |  |  |  |  |
| Where an APC is paid, do you check the license terms are compliant with funder or institutional policies? Is this the responsibility of the author, or the administrator approving the payment?               |  |  |  |  |
| Do you require authors to raise a Purchase Order for APCs? If so, have you considered how to accommodate prepayment accounts within this process?   |  |  |  |  |
| <b>Management information and compliance monitoring</b>   |  |  |  |  |
| Are you able to report on 'gold' route open access article numbers and costs:   |  |  |  |  |
| By month?   |  |  |  |  |
| By publisher?   |  |  |  |  |

<sup>4</sup> Under Generally Accepted Accounting Practice, expenditure of this nature should be recognised as articles are published and an APC is charged to the prepayment account, not when the cash prepayment is made.

|  |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| By journal?  |  |  |  |  |
| By grant funder (ie the funder of the research that gave rise to the article)?   |  |  |  |  |
| By APC funding source (ie funders' block grants, other research projects or institutional funds)?  |  |  |  |  |
| By discipline area or academic school /department?   |  |  |  |  |
| By license?  |  |  |  |  |
| Are you able to report on 'green' route open access activity:  |  |  |  |  |
| By number of articles deposited/held?  |  |  |  |  |
| By numbers of articles deposited/held as a percentage of total publications?   |  |  |  |  |
| By number of articles deposited, and as a percentage of total publications, for specific funders (eg RCUK, Wellcome Trust)?  |  |  |  |  |
| By downloads (including numbers, geographical region, etc)?  |  |  |  |  |
| Have you considered sharing data on gold and or green open access activity with comparable institutions to allow progress to be benchmarked effectively (eg through <a href="#">IRUS-UK</a> for institutional repository usage data)?  |  |  |  |  |
| Where you have prepayment arrangements with publishers, are you able to obtain regular reports on account activity?  |  |  |  |  |
| Are you able to compare expenditure on APCs with expenditure through the traditional subscription model, both in aggregate and by publisher?<br><br>Have you established a baseline position against which potential savings in subscriptions costs as APC expenditure rises could be tracked? |  |  |  |  |
| Are you able to determine the average APC paid by your institution, and compare average APCs paid over time  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| and between publishers?  |  |  |  |  |
| Have you undertaken scenario modelling of your likely expenditure on APCs, based on publications, funder mandates and expected uptake of OA? |  |  |  |  |
| Have you used this to inform your financial planning and budgeting for open access charges?  |  |  |  |  |

### Acknowledgements and further resources

Some elements of this document have been informed by the “Guide to good practices for university open-access (OA) policies” (accessed 16 May 2013), available at:

[http://cyber.law.harvard.edu/hoap/Good\\_practices\\_for\\_university\\_open-access\\_policies](http://cyber.law.harvard.edu/hoap/Good_practices_for_university_open-access_policies).

Links to further resources and key guidance on open access can be found on the website of the Open Access Implementation Group, <http://open-access.org.uk/information-and-guidance/>, while detailed guidelines on repository setup and management are available from the Repository Support Project, <http://www.rsp.ac.uk/>.