OA good practice pathfinder update: Spring 2015

Supporting universities’ open access implementation through sharing examples of good practice
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Welcome to the spring 2015 OA Good Practice Update

We are pleased to introduce the spring update from the OA Good Practice Pathfinder projects. We will share how the projects are progressing and, crucially, what you can take away and use to enable better OA implementation within your own institution.

With Hefce’s policy on OA (hefce.ac.uk/pubs/year/2014/2014077) in the next REF coming into force in less than a year (1 April 2016), how institutions scope, implement, evaluate and, most importantly, share good practice for OA implementation is becoming ever more important and pressing. While there remains no single standardised approach that will act as a panacea, the Jisc and Pathfinders work is progressing steadily to clarify and offer solutions to parts of the complex OA implementation puzzle, such as around metadata and standards or cost management.

In this edition, we have brought together the work of the OA Good Practice Pathfinders and the work of Jisc OA projects/services under relevant themes/headings so that it is easier to see how they are addressing key areas of concern around OA implementation. We have also developed an at-a-glance update so that you can see what to expect from the Pathfinders and Jisc over the next few months.

Most of the Jisc OA projects/services outlined here were presented in more detail at the very successful Jisc Digifest (jisc.ac.uk/events/jisc-digital-festival-2015-09-mar-2015), and regular updates are also posted on the Jisc scholarly communications blog (scholarlycommunications.jiscinvolve.org/wp/). However, given that we are fast approaching the Jisc Monitor project’s conclusion, we have taken the opportunity in this edition to include a special feature on its developments and outputs.

This update, along with the Pathfinder workshops and online interaction, is an essential way to share the findings of the Pathfinder projects so that the wider sector can benefit from lessons learnt and the practical outputs from the initiative. We are always interested in your feedback, so don’t hesitate to get in touch via the OA Good Practice blog (openaccess.jiscinvolve.org), Twitter (@OA_GoodPractice) or email (oagoodpractice@jiscmail.ac.uk).

Here’s a reminder of all the Pathfinder projects:

- **Coventry University: O2OA**
  - blogs.coventry.ac.uk/researchblog/category/oa/
  - **Associates:** University of Northampton, DeMontfort University
  - Will enable HEIs with limited financial and human resources to consider aspects of impact with regard to OA implementation.

- **Oxford Brooks University: Making Sense of OA**
  - sensemakingopenaccess.blogspot.co.uk/
  - **Associates:** Nottingham Trent University, University of Portsmouth
  - Will help understanding around researcher behaviours through ‘sense-making’ for better OA engagement.

- **Northumbria University: Optimising Resources to Develop a Strategic Approach to OA**
  - oapathfinder.wordpress.com/
  - **Associate:** Sunderland University
  - Will enable HEIs with limited external funding to develop evidence-based, creative responses to the challenges and opportunities of OA.

- **University of Hull: HHuLOA**
  - library3.hud.ac.uk/blogs/hhuola/
  - **Associates:** University of Huddersfield, University of Lincoln
  - HHuLOA will focus on good practice to identify and implement a range of OA initiatives across three non-RLUK research intensive partners.

- **University of Manchester: opeNWorks**
  - blog.openworks.library.manchester.ac.uk/
  - **Associates:** Edge Hill University, Liverpool John Moores University, University of Liverpool, University of Salford
  - Will build a north west community of practice for OA, producing toolkits, running workshops and hosting a landmark conference.

- **University of Glasgow: E2EOA**
  - e2eoa.org/
  - **Associates:** University of Southampton, Lancaster University, University of Kent
  - Will improve OA metadata management via EPrints while considering transferability of outputs to other platforms.

- **University of Bath**
  - gw4openaccess.wordpress.com/
  - **Associates:** University of Bristol, University of Exeter, University of Cardiff
  - Will examine OA best practice by looking at advocacy, publication management and data investigation.

- **University of Edinburgh LOCH**
  - libraryblogs.is.ed.ac.uk/loch/
  - **Associates:** Heriot Watt University, University of St Andrews
  - Will fulfil a need to provide guidance and evidence of best practice in the provision and management of OA services.

For updates on all Jisc OA projects/services, please see the Jisc scholarly communications blog (scholarlycommunications.jiscinvolve.org/wp/).
Spotlight on... Jisc Monitor
Frank Manista, community engagement officer

Jisc Monitor is a project to investigate, prototype and test the value and feasibility of services to help universities show compliance with funder OA mandates and monitor article processing charge (APC) payments.

Since the new year, Monitor has been working toward its final sprint of development activity. This has centred around APC aggregation, as well as developing a local management system for institutions dealing with those charges. Completing at the end of May 2015, the project has engaged over 60 institutions over the last 12 months. It is expected that project deliverables will include functioning prototypes mapped to the three headline use cases and released as open and open source software. An evaluation of prototypes and associated findings and recommendations will inform Jisc decision making and any commitments beyond May 2015.

The full requirements catalogue (or user stories) as voiced by the community, which has underpinned the development of Jisc Monitor, is available here (demonstrators.ostephens.com/monitor-reqs/).

Monitor Local
Following consultation with the sector, feedback suggested that Monitor could be helpful in providing a fairly rudimentary piece of software that could help an institution’s OA teams control and monitor deadlines and email communication with authors (and others) in the process of chasing manuscripts in the three months from acceptance. It could also provide detailed information on institutional OA mandates and thereby inform policy review.

At the Birmingham prototype workshop, the Monitor team demonstrated the scope of Monitor Local’s financial data recording function and then posed a key question – would the proposed approach be too complex for everyday operations, especially for institutions processing small numbers of APCs? Users wholly welcomed the approach, especially when balanced by the option to enter data in the simplest possible way when an institution wishes to record only a total cost without prior estimates, order values or breakdown. Based on that advice, the team will adopt a similar approach when it comes to making compliance management flexible, while addressing essential funder mandates.

Saving time in the face of both volume and complexity was a key principle for Monitor Local design and was emphasised at each event. Institutions of differing sizes and systems. This provides a level of business intelligence not otherwise available, offering multiple benefits:

- **Institutions** – can compare and benchmark areas such as pricing and volumes for gold OA with other institutions or against national averages; and assess publishers based on both price and actual compliance.
- **Jisc Collections** – can identify anomalies in terms of pricing and compliance; trace potential double dipping based on subscription data in KB+; and, as a result, inform UK negotiations with publishers.
- **Funders** – can understand the national picture and the direction of travel over time regarding OA mandates and thereby inform policy review.

There has been positive critical feedback to demonstrations of Monitor UK Aggregation, which includes both cost and compliance data, building on the Total Cost of Ownership project recommendations. The prototype at apc.ooz.cottagelabs.com/ contains over 8,000 transactions across a wide range of institutions and publishers, suggesting real opportunities for further refinement.

Monitor Guide
In a more perfect world, authors would be clearly identified in the publication ecosystem by a single, reliable identifier such as an Orcid. In reality, institutions face serious challenges especially in identifying non-lead author involvement in the short and medium term while these practices are becoming adopted.

Monitor is prototyping a service to help with this Guide (Gathering Useful IDs Early) is an ID mapping, or co-referencing, service based on the premise that, in the short and medium term, there will be no single or pervasive method for identifying organisations, people and grant IDs throughout the publication supply chain.

This approach will drive an automated “did you know?” service whereby institutions could be alerted about new or updated publication events involving their academics about which they may not otherwise have been aware.
Many of the Pathfinders’ baselining activities have been released since the new year, providing snapshots of where they are in terms of OA implementation.

The Manchester Pathfinder (opeNWorks blog.openworks.library.manchester.ac.uk/) has focused on developing case studies to provide a baseline level of OA activity at each of the project’s universities (Edge Hill University, Liverpool John Moores University, University of Liverpool, University of Salford) during the period 2013/14 based on set criteria, e.g., number of staff supporting OA, number of deposits in the institutional repository, number of APCs paid.

Analysis of the case studies identified common challenges for all institutions, i.e., implementing the Hefce OA policy and OA advocacy, and highlighted some difficulties encountered during the case study period, e.g., reporting on total APC expenditure and total research outputs. See the full report and individual case studies here (bit.ly/1Gtoubs).

Based on the case studies, development is underway on the first opeNWorks toolkit which is being designed to meet the needs of institutions with limited resources as they prepare to support the implementation of the Hefce OA policy. The project has identified the following resources to provide a sound OA foundation for staff new to a research support role or in roles only partially dedicated to OA:

- OA glossary
- FAQ for new staff
- Introduction to OA and Hefce policy presentation template
- Workflow templates

The resources will be shared with a number of north west university library colleagues at the end of May for testing, with the toolkit being publicly released in June. The toolkit will be hosted on the Nowal (nowal.ac.uk/) website and will form the basis of the north west community of good OA practice, as a trusted resource for time-poor colleagues.

At the Hull Pathfinder (HHuLOA library3.hud.ac.uk/blogs/hhuoloa), work has been focused on creating and inputting to a baseline template (library3.hud.ac.uk/blogs/hhuoloa) of current OA activity within the project’s institutions (Hull, Huddersfield and Lincoln) as a way of identifying areas that require attention, and also to highlight where there has been progress as they move towards April 2016. This template will be updated every six months by the project partners, but the spreadsheet is being made available openly so that other institutions can use it to establish their own baselines and help identify progress based on this, with support available from the project if needed. This data can be applied to local initiatives and could provide an opportunity to make a business case for further development, but will also inform sector-wide issues and highlight where additional effort outside of institutions may be merited.

Taking this as its cue, the team have now launched MIAO - My Individual Assessment of Open Access (bit.ly/1Ljr6YJ) which is a self-assessment tool aimed at researchers so that they can gauge for themselves what they know about OA and how their institution is able to support them. This is potentially a really effective icebreaker for encouraging researchers to engage with OA.

Following the launch of CIAO and MIAO tools, the Oxford Brookes Pathfinder will now focus on ethnographic interviews with researchers to teasing out technical/procedural workflows and their effect on individual researcher behaviour so that any development is underpinned by behavioural change and academic engagement strategies. The project is aiming to release anonymised, coded data from researcher interviews, particularly from Nottingham Trent University in June but much more will be on its way in the summer in terms of how this ethnographic methodology has been implemented.
OA cost management

Whilst Jisc has been undertaking work to determine how much it really costs universities to comply with open access policies (bit.ly/1za2aft) overall in terms of the rising costs of APCs, several of the Pathfinders have been considering the institutional management costs and effective workflows for managing gold OA.

Since the release of the Sparc Europe and London Higher’s Counting the Costs of Open Access in the UK (bit.ly/1ITjD3m) report, which puts directly attributable institutional management costs of gold OA at £81 per article, the sector has a clearer picture of the institutional costs associated with managing the gold route for RCUK- OA funded research outputs.

However, the Bath Pathfinder (gw4openaccess.wordpress.com/) has sought to take a contrasting perspective, taking a narrower and deeper view of gold OA management, specifically putting together a functional cost analysis evaluation (bit.ly/1T5OrBk) of the APC payment process from data gathered from the GW4 institutions (Universities of Bath, Bristol, Cardiff and Exeter). In doing this, they were able to identify where there might be room for efficiencies in terms of the cost, effort and number of activities from various payment methods.

They found that three of the four institutions (with similar levels of research base) had remarkably similar patterns around the implementation of APC payments, with the most resource intensive activities being centred around the payment of APCs (in particular payment of APCs by invoice which tended to have the highest number of activities in the process, not least adding suppliers to finance systems). An obvious but important finding evidenced by the report is that the larger the RCUK grant, the smaller the administrative costs and time for each APC payment. There are clear economies of scale.

Along similar lines as the Counting the Costs of OA report, Bath found that the institutional costs were in the order of £30+ per simple APC for these comparable institutions, although these costs didn’t account for overheads relating to problem investigation or incomplete data.

Bath has also just released a ‘Good Practice Guide: Using purchase cards for APC payments’ (bit.ly/1cZ2jOl), which considers the advantages, limits and issues for institutions that are considering (or currently using) purchase cards for APC payment. The project is also working to release FAQs on APCs for publishers. This has been developed with the RLUK Open Access Publisher Engagement Group who are planning to liaise with publishers about APC payment and OA processes in order to highlight existing examples of best practice and common problems.

In June the Northumbria Pathfinder (oapathfinder.wordpress.com/) will also release early versions of its shareable cost modelling tool. This will be an Excel spreadsheet tool that institutions will be able to model different scenarios with respect to OA in order to make better informed, strategic decisions on policies and funding. The draft scope for the tool is:

» All institutions are likely to have targets and/or projections for number of REFable articles per annum in future, so this can be used in the model by all institutions

» Model could use global average APC or average for each REF panel

» Subscription-related discounts/vouchers should be accounted for in average APC calculation

» Model could be used to make case for increased APC funding (as for Northumbria) or could be used to make case for more green OA and/or institution-published OA journals

» Model could include targets for RCUK funded articles

» Model could be used to show difference between RCUK-estimated average APC cost and actual APC costs

1 Counting the Costs of OA in the UK report attributes costs of £33 per article for Green OA processing

Jisc Collections continues to address the cost UK higher education institutions face in maintaining subscriptions and also paying for APCs to the same publishers for the same journals. It is doing this through the Total Cost of Ownership (bit.ly/1mjiy4n) project and the related offsetting negotiations. While these negotiations are ongoing, Jisc Collections has released new guidelines for publishers on the Principles for Offset Agreements. It sets out the five principles which UK HEIs expect will drive the design of effective offset systems, along with a clear rationale for each, explaining how they will support a managed transition to fully open access in the spirit set out in the Finch report. More information is available here (bit.ly/1za2aft).

Updates on Jisc’s negotiations with publishers are also given to the Jisc Electronic Information Resources Working Group (bit.ly/1Aox3mN) at each meeting, and summaries of those meetings posted on the Jisc Collections website. To see more on how Jisc is working with publishers around effective OA implementation, see the How publishers might help universities implement OA (bit.ly/1xPzE0j) blog post.
OA structural workflows

Given the wide scope and broad impact of research funders’ OA policies, as well as the differing approaches of HEIs across the sector, some Pathfinders have focused on processes/workflows/lifecycles related to the implementation of OA across the institution.

The HHU/LOA project has taken a holistic view of the OA life cycle, bringing together Jisc OA/above-campus services, publisher services and institutional workflow with the OAWAL thematic approaches to OA implementation. To give clarity to the wide range and sometimes complex interactions that take place across the OA ecosystem, this diagram follows the logic of the seven stages of the publishing process (as described by Neil Jacobs, Jisc). It shows how these map to institutional processes, followed by publisher services that directly impact upon the work of the OA team. The project then went on to map Jisc OA and above-campus services to the life cycle, noting where Publication Router currently sits and where it is planned to sit, i.e., at point of acceptance. Finally, the project added the six thematic sections of OAWAL showing where the resources fit with the lifecycle. Undoubtedly this diagram will be the basis of future discussions relating to OA workflow and how it is supported.

In order to inform interim best practice policy and procedure documents, which will focus on developing functional workflows across participating institutions, the Northumbria Pathfinder project is focusing on separate institutional case studies in order to build a richer understanding of their various approaches and structures, the problems they face and the lessons we can all learn in how to respond creatively to open access challenges. The case studies will be divided into five thematic areas (Costs; Structure and workflows; Policy and strategy; Advocacy and training; and Metadata and systems) and a multi-disciplinary group of stakeholders (e.g., library, academic, research funding, policy managers, finance) will discuss potential solutions to these issues and what works and doesn’t work in their own institutions. Interim case study outputs will start to appear on its blog in June, and the intention is that these will be “living” documents, updated over the remainder of the project and finalised with a follow-up visit/workshop next year.

Linked to its work around cost management, the Bath Pathfinder has used functional cost analysis (FCA) methodology to break down APC processing workflows. As FCA has its roots in engineering and manufacturing, it was a useful tool in investigating labour costs per APC payment and identifying resource-intensive functions with a view to later improvement. In particular, the Bath Pathfinder found that the Functional Family Tree useful as a starting point for breaking down the activities (further information on the application of FCA methodology is included in the report bit.ly/1ekmWp5).
St Andrews has also given a detailed view of its experiences with implementing the Lean method within the OA and research publications support team in May 2014, as well as the follow-up to this exercise and the impact it has had on the team’s day-to-day activities. Details of process improvements undertaken at St Andrews and example documentation, which is available for re-use, are available [here](bit.ly/1Hm1TiPh), while the case study report is available [here](bit.ly/1BfQeKu).

Following the completion of its researcher needs assessment [bit.ly/1K8gU57], the Coventry Pathfinder (O2OA) [bit.ly/1Q0Unc2] is now assimilating this work to form the basis of its subsequent planning processes and workflows stage (between now and September 2015). The project very much views OA implementation as a mix of technical/procedural workflows and individual researcher behaviour, therefore behaviour change and academic engagement strategies underpin how the project progresses. Processes are in place for stage two of the project to combine both elements:

1. Each partner is mapping out their existing technical processes for OA (gold/green, depositing, copyright etc)
2. The project will then overlay the behavioural findings to determine:
   i. Likely risks to compliance at key points throughout the process
   ii. The strategies / educational needs to address these issues
   iii. Technical process revisions needed

This will give them a comprehensive map to help prioritise activities and implement/best in stage three resulting in an interim agreed set of OA workflows and processes which will be released in June.

Lancaster University, part of the Glasgow Pathfinder (E2EOA), has also given a comprehensive picture [bit.ly/1cRyjUC] of how processes at the institution have benefited from the outputs of the Pathfinder project and how it has already made some changes after considering good practice at other institutions in the E2EOA project.

Jisc Publications Router (broker.edina.ac.uk/) automates the direct delivery of scholarly works (green/gold OA and/or pre-embargoed records) from multiple suppliers (such as publishers or subject repositories) to the appropriate institutional repository. Since the release of the REF requirements, Jisc has been developing a workplan for how the Publications Router could best support the capture of authors’ accepted manuscripts (AAMs) as part of this developing service. The Router team is engaged in active discussions with several major publishers on ingesting and redistributing to institutional repositories (etc) content they have accepted or published but plans continue for ongoing development and announcements will be made shortly.

However, the Jisc Publications Router blog [bit.ly/1SBNmlW] has announced two key developments.

The first introduces the new look Router website [bit.ly/1HyXRmX] - the Router has had a spring clean now that it has moved into a new phase as a beta service.

The second provides information about the postcard notification service [bit.ly/1AoAGsH]. This allows users to receive updates on new content - daily updates on what the router has received over the last 24 hours - for their chosen repository or repositories. The postcards allow repository managers to get a sense of the content that could be available to them from the Router and this will increase as more publishers provide the Router with their content.
Implementing OA policies

Focusing on the implementation of Hefce’s OA policy for the next REF, the Glasgow Pathfinder (E2EOA) hosted the Open Access and the REF: Issues and Potential Solutions (bit.ly/1Hmd6SS) workshop in January. The workshop provided an excellent opportunity to bring together various key stakeholders to discuss problems and procedures and develop ideas and resulted in the following key recommendations:

1. Core metadata should be added to the list of fields (metadata profile) for OA and should be agreed as a national standard via the Consortia Advancing Standards in Research Administration Information (Casra-UK) Open Access Working Group.

2. The community should continue to raise questions with Hefce on REF requirements and ask Hefce to consider how institutions might self-audit in a proposed light-touch environment.

3. E2E project to encourage a show and tell approach to sharing OA developments.

4. Systems amendments are needed to perform basic support such as embargo management and compliance reporting.

5. Advance information direct from publishers on embargo management and compliance reporting.

In relation to point 4, E2EOA is currently testing OA environments (RIOXX & ROXX.net), other OA fields, reporting) as well as developing an Eprints metadata spec for institutional management requirements, rather than data that is required for funder reporting.

The full workshop report is available here (bit.ly/1KowYCM). Due to demand, E2EOA also plans to advertise another workshop on this topic based on feedback from the last. More information to follow soon.

The Hull Pathfinder (HHuLOA) has also been creating a policy tool to provide a means by which academics can easily understand what each funder requires of them, and what OA those funders were prepared to support.

Within this, the project has pulled out the important and useful statements from each policy to draw up a “quick-and-dirty” set of standard terms for categorising and ordering similar terms from different policies.

This draft spreadsheet will eventually be used to drive a demonstration web app which will allow users to select multiple policies to which they are subject along with some local information, and generate an individual report of the policy sections which are applicable to them at a given point in time. The project is recording the details of all these policies in an open, editable Google spreadsheet (Incn.eu/cdz8).

In a nutshell, the work will have the following objectives:

- Assess the current readiness of the UK higher education sector for implementation of the REF OA policy in April 2016.
- Identify any further cultural/technical developments that are needed to enable successful implementation of the policy.
- Assess the risks to delivery of these developments and any mitigating actions that can be taken by institutions and/or Jisc over the next 12 months.

The outcomes of the review will be reported to Jisc and shared with Hefce, and key findings from the work will be made available on the Jisc OA Good Practice blog in early June. More information is available here (bit.ly/1KoxvYE).

See also Digifest presentation slides (bit.ly/1FCz6Ux).

Jisc study: assessing progress towards implementation of OA policy for the post-2014 REF

To help Jisc and other stakeholders understand in a deeper way what the on-ground challenges are for institutions in implementing the policy, Jisc has commissioned Rob Johnson of Research Consulting to undertake a short, focused study to assess progress towards meeting Hefce’s requirements and clarify a critical path for potential support activities over the next 12 months.

In a nutshell, the work will have the following objectives:

- Assess the current readiness of the UK higher education sector for implementation of the REF OA policy in April 2016.
- Identify any further cultural/technical developments that are needed to enable successful implementation of the policy.
- Assess the risks to delivery of these developments and any mitigating actions that can be taken by institutions and/or Jisc over the next 12 months.

The outcomes of the review will be reported to Jisc and shared with Hefce, and key findings from the work will be made available on the Jisc OA Good Practice blog in early June. More information is available here (bit.ly/1KoxvYE).

Jisc OpenAIRE

OpenAIRE (openaire.eu) is the infrastructure used by the European Commission to harvest, showcase, and report on publications arising from Horizon 2020 projects. Jisc is a partner and is working in a number of work packages.

In April, OpenAIRE released details of when and how authors of papers arising from the previous Framework 7 programme can apply for funds to pay APCs to make those papers OA.

Following discussions with UK stakeholders, in May, Jisc will start concerted outreach work with universities and researchers working on Horizon 2020 projects to help them comply with the H2020 OA policy.

More details of the OpenAIRE project and its programme of work are available from its website (openaire.eu/).

See also Digifest presentation slides (bit.ly/1FCz6Ux)
March was an exceptionally busy month for work around coordinating OA advocacy. At Arma’s Good Practice Exchange event (bit.ly/1G7tmgx), St Andrews and Edinburgh Universities (from the Edinburgh Pathfinder (LOCH libraryblogs.is.ed.ac.uk/loch) outlined approaches to preparing for OA in the next REF. St Andrews reported that it was adopting a more centralised approach with the library taking ownership for all the administration, while Edinburgh is adopting a more decentralised approach, with more work being carried out in schools and colleges. Edinburgh also shared a case study looking at the specifics of implementing the REF OA requirements in the context of medical sciences (era.lib.ed.ac.uk/handle/1842/10010). Slides are available from both presentations (St Andrews bit.ly/1R9s4K4 and Edinburgh’s slides bit.ly/1FHpRrj), as well as their planning checklists (era.lib.ed.ac.uk/handle/1842/10014).

A key feature of Edinburgh’s approach to putting in place effective workflows is the process of agreeing implementation plans within many of its schools to agree locally how the new OA requirements will apply, and to detail the processes needed to make this happen. An example of this is its College of Humanities and Social Sciences School Implementation Plan (era.lib.ed.ac.uk/handle/1842/10013). This college is also starting to think about what resources will need to be put in place to manage any additional workload. At present the college is considering employing new OA facilitators to work in schools and in coordination with the library’s scholarly communications team. A (draft) job description (era.lib.ed.ac.uk/handle/1842/10016) is also available. Plans are also underway to put in place some training for administrators to validate items in PURE. Related documentation is available here (libraryblogs.is.ed.ac.uk/loch/2015/04/09/pure-validation-training/).

The UCL Pathfinder (Pathways to OA blogs.ucl.ac.uk/open-access) also held its very well-attended Join the Dots workshop (bit.ly/1R9s3fw) in March which brought together a host of different stakeholders involved in OA communication, particularly publishers, funders and – of course – institutions. The aim was to share experiences of communicating the OA message to researchers and to identify best practice and areas for improvement. With representatives from a range of different publishers, including Taylor & Francis, BMJ and Oxford University Press, as well as from RCUK and Hefce, the workshop provided a balanced view of the challenges and opportunities in communicating OA to UK researchers.

The publishers discussed the difficulty of delivering a simple, straightforward message in a global environment and the likely benefits of technical changes such as assigning DOIs on acceptance. The UCL Pathfinder team also noted the multiplicity of stakeholders in OA and the complications of trying to change cultures at a time of technical upheaval (particularly where institutional systems are in flux). The value of building support for OA at senior levels of an institution were central discussions and gave rise to questions about where responsibility for compliance monitoring lies – with academic faculties or with support services such as the library or research office.

Some fascinating insights from the events were recorded on Twitter under the Road2015 hashtag, and you can also see the summary (bit.ly/1D7w939) of the event. Building on from the workshop, the UCL team has released its Advocacy Toolkit (bit.ly/1HvQtmn), designed to provide good practice recommendations and practical advice for UK HEIs to help them communicate with researchers about funder requirements and institutional policies on open access.

Of those projects focusing on understanding researcher behaviour (in particular Oxford Brookes and Coventry), a great outcome has been the strong links developed in order to avoid duplication and to actively work collaboratively to build up knowledge and understanding in the area. To support this, the Coventry Pathfinder presented at the Oxford Brookes workshop on 20 May so that the event supported knowledge transfer from both projects into ideas for strategies, solutions and techniques to support OA. See here (bit.ly/1EnivT0) for more details.

If all that wasn’t enough, following an excellent suggestion from St Andrews, we asked Hefce whether it would be happy for local repurposing/customisation of its OA publicity/communications material, currently available here (bit.ly/1EnivT0). In response, Hefce agreed to allow the design to be used by institutions and then repurposed/customised for local use, if credited with “image used with permission of the Higher Education Funding Council for England”.

Congratulations to the University of Portsmouth - the first Pathfinder institution to openly share its designs (featured opposite and also available here bit.ly/1PMNGiQ).
The Glasgow Pathfinder project (E2EOA e2eoa.org) has been very active in terms of developing technical solutions to the challenges that OA presents and putting in place the building blocks for the technical integration of metadata standards.

The project has been working closely with the Jisc/Casrai UK pilot (bit.ly/1TJtdu) (that runs until June 15) to utilise the Casrai (casrai.org) framework for OA reporting. So far, in EPrints, entities that cover compliance with the RCUK requirements for open access via the RIOXX (rioxx.net) application profile have been added to the draft UK OA profile. REF, European, and additional OA requirements will be added soon and gaps will be identified via a test version on EPrints. E2EOA has also been working with the Casrai UK Open Access Working Group to try to clarify some of the terminology (bit.ly/1Hyz8F) used to describe OA.

The project has also been focusing on identifying which metadata fields institutions need within institutional systems for day-to-day management of OA rather than only that data which is required for reporting to third parties such as REF, RCUK and EU. Currently the metadata spec is being tested for functionality in the Glasgow Eprints repository however there are plans to share this with the EPrints user group and then more widely. These plans will be made live and discussions around a demonstration of this will be on the E2EOA blog (e2eoa.org/2015/02/20/eprints-open-access-work/) in April.

Edinburgh have also been gearing up for the implementation of the new REF Open Access requirements, by starting to trial new workflows. To support this, they have put together some training for administrators to validate items in PURE and have published some documentation being used. Current training sessions available here bit.ly/1cilvWA

Jisc RIOXX
The final version of the EPrints RIOXX plugin is now available for general use and reflects the current version of the RIOXX Application Profile. It can be installed from the EPrints Bazaar (bazaar.eprints.org/) or from GitHub (github.com/eprintsug/rioxx2).

The RIOXX Guidelines and Application Profile provide a mechanism to help institutional repositories comply with the RCUK policy on OA. Some of the required metadata is also relevant to the REF. RIOXX was developed in close cooperation with RCUK and its adoption is strongly encouraged. Jisc has funded the development of an EPrints plugin designed to simplify the process of achieving RIOXX compliance. More information here (bit.ly/1IOWalw).

The timeline below outlines the outputs from the Pathfinders that have been created over the past few months with a brief snapshot of what’s to come.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pathfinder</th>
<th>Output Type</th>
<th>Output</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Edinburgh (LOCH) libraryblogs.is.ed.ac.uk/loch</td>
<td>Advocacy</td>
<td>Advocacy materials</td>
<td>This case study (era.lib.ed.ac.uk/handle/1842/10010) gives an overview of the local preparations being made for OA in the post-2014 REF within the College of Medicine and Veterinary Medicine (CMVM) at the University of Edinburgh. Communication planning - exemplar emails: College of Medicine (era.lib.ed.ac.uk/handle/1842/10012) School of Mathematics (era.lib.ed.ac.uk/handle/1842/10011). OA and REF in humanities and social sciences: Example School OA Plan (era.lib.ed.ac.uk/handle/1842/10013). OA facilitator job description (era.lib.ed.ac.uk/handle/1842/10016).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edinburgh (LOCH) libraryblogs.is.ed.ac.uk/loch</td>
<td>Structural workflows</td>
<td>Lean exercise case study - University of St Andrews</td>
<td>This case study (bit.ly/1HRQa6u) outlines St Andrews University’s experiences of undertaking a Lean exercise, and provides updates on progress after the exercise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glasgow (E2EOA) e2eoa.org</td>
<td>Metadata and standards</td>
<td>Metadata spec</td>
<td>For institutional management requirements, rather than data that is required for funder reporting. It has been made live in Glasgow Eprints for testing and will be shared among the Eprints user group and then more widely. More information (e2eoa.org/2015/02/20/eprints-open-access-work/).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hull (HHuLOA) library3.hud.ac.uk/blog/hhuloa</td>
<td>Structural Workflows</td>
<td>OA service lifecycle review</td>
<td>A graphic representation (library3.hud.ac.uk/blog/hhuloa/) of where services sit within the OA lifecycle and what gaps there may be.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### May 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pathfinder</th>
<th>Output Type</th>
<th>Output</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bath (GW4 group)</td>
<td>Cost management</td>
<td>FAQs on APCs for publishers</td>
<td>Process related issues about APC payment and OA processes to highlight existing examples of best practice and common problems. To include additional comments to support the issues put forward by the RLUK OA subgroup. Coming soon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bath (GW4 group)</td>
<td>Cost management</td>
<td>Guide to credit cards for APC payment processing</td>
<td>This brief guide (bit.ly/1WLYHF) outlines the benefits and challenges of different payment methods and gives some good practice ideas for those considering using these methods of payment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCL (Pathways to OA)</td>
<td>Advocacy</td>
<td>Advocacy toolkit</td>
<td>This Advocacy toolkit (bit.ly/1HVzRmR) is designed to provide good practice recommendations and practical advice for UK HEIs to help them communicate with researchers about funder requirements and institutional policies on open access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glasgow (E2EOA)</td>
<td>Metadata and standards</td>
<td>Metadata spec</td>
<td>This will be the first draft of the Casrai OA profile which will be shared widely for comment. More information (bit.ly/1QOUuc2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford Brookes (Making sense of OA)</td>
<td>Advocacy</td>
<td>Researcher behaviour research data release Methodology testing Evaluation guide to ethnographic methodology re: researcher behaviour</td>
<td>Anonymised data from researcher interviews released, particularly from Nottingham Trent University and methodology testing. Evaluation guide to ethnographic methodology re: researcher behaviour. Coming soon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northumbria (oapathfinder)</td>
<td>Structural Workflows</td>
<td>Case studies</td>
<td>This will be the first iteration of OA implementation case studies (Lincoln, Durham, Hull and Coventry) to understand their various approaches and structures. Coming soon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hull (HHuLOA)</td>
<td>Policy and Strategy</td>
<td>Policy landscape tool</td>
<td>This tool (bit.ly/1lnnRlO) is the first step to identifying as many policies, mandates, and statements from stakeholder organisations as possible, and to record them systematically so that these are more easily understood</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### June 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pathfinder</th>
<th>Output Type</th>
<th>Output</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bath (GW4 group)</td>
<td>Cost management</td>
<td>Blog post on APC intermediary services</td>
<td>This will be a commentary on the current state of APC intermediary services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coventry (O2OA)</td>
<td>Structural workflows</td>
<td>Interim agreed set of OA workflows and processes</td>
<td>These processes/workflows will overlay researcher behavioural findings to determine risks and technical/process revisions needed, on top of mapped out existing technical processes for OA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edinburgh (LDOCH)</td>
<td>Structural workflows</td>
<td>Pilot workflows and services short report</td>
<td>Heriot-Watt, St Andrews and Edinburgh Universities will provide a short report detailing innovative new workflows being implemented to support the implementation of REF requirements for OA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hull (HHuLOA)</td>
<td>Structural workflows</td>
<td>Project workshop</td>
<td>Given that open access is promoted as a means of increasing awareness of research outputs, and generate greater interest in the research of an institution, how might open access be able to contribute to the development of research? Where does open access sit in within research strategy, and what place does it have in growing research income and reputation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manchester (opeNWorks)</td>
<td>Structural workflows</td>
<td>Toolkit</td>
<td>Designed to meet the needs of institutions with limited resources: this toolkit will help institutions prepare to support the implementation of the Hefce OA policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northumbria (oapathfinder)</td>
<td>Cost Management</td>
<td>Cost modelling tool</td>
<td>This will be an early version of a shareable cost modelling tool. It will be an Excel-based tool which institutions can use to model different scenarios with respect to OA in order to make better informed, strategic decisions on policies and funding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Two prototypes have been developed:

**On submitting an article to a journal**
- Information on journal OA policies, and how they enable you to comply with your funder’s policy
- SHERPA RoMEO, SHERPA JULIET, SHERPA FACT

**On acceptance of the article by the journal**
- Automatic notification to (and perhaps deposit of the article into your institutional repository)
- Publications Router

**On payment of APC**
- Offset arrangements to save costs for institutions
- Jisc Collections Negotiations

---

More information on timeframes for Jisc OA projects and service can be found on the [Jisc scholarly communications blog](http://bit.ly/1c93A42)

### At-a-glance update from Jisc OA projects/services March - July 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>When in lifecycle</th>
<th>Services for researchers</th>
<th>Services for librarians and research managers</th>
<th>Services and projects</th>
<th>Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>On submitting an article to a journal</strong></td>
<td>Information on journal OA policies, and how they enable you to comply with your funder’s policy</td>
<td>SHERPA RoMEO, SHERPA JULIET, SHERPA FACT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>On acceptance of the article by the journal</strong></td>
<td>Automatic notification to (and perhaps deposit of the article into your institutional repository)</td>
<td>Publications Router</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>On payment of APC</strong></td>
<td>Offset arrangements to save costs for institutions</td>
<td>Jisc Collections Negotiations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Services for researchers

- Jisc Collections website. The next meetings are on 6 July and 7 September.
- Springer offset agreement ([bit.ly/1xPzEoJ](http://bit.ly/1xPzEoJ)) announced.
- Following consultation with library directors, Jisc Collections has published a set of principles ([bit.ly/1aZa2aM](http://bit.ly/1aZa2aM)) that offset arrangements should address to be most valuable to UK universities.

### Services for librarians and research managers

- Have published: How publishers might help universities implement OA ([bit.ly/1yPeEoJ](http://bit.ly/1yPeEoJ)) including proposals for more helpful notifications on acceptance to authors and institutions. Initial discussions with publishers and their trade bodies have been cautiously promising and a workshop with publishers is planned for 8th June.

### Services and projects

- Jisc Collections has published a set of principles ([bit.ly/1aZa2aM](http://bit.ly/1aZa2aM)) that offset arrangements should address to be most valuable to UK universities.
- Updates on negotiations with publishers are given to the Jisc Electronic Information Resources Working Group ([bit.ly/10x3wN](http://bit.ly/10x3wN)) at each meeting and summaries of those meetings posted on the Jisc Collections website. The next meetings are on 6 July and 7 September.

---

### Data on APC expenditure by 25 HEIs during 2014 has been collected and published ([bit.ly/1HyQXLD](http://bit.ly/1HyQXLD)) showing a 288% increase in the number of APCs paid compared to 2013. The data shows that offsetting schemes are already reducing the average price of an APC. A further update is available here ([bit.ly/1ROq0g](http://bit.ly/1ROq0g)).
March - July (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>When in lifecycle</th>
<th>Services for researchers</th>
<th>Services for librarians and research managers</th>
<th>Services and projects</th>
<th>Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On monitoring/reporting compliance to funders</td>
<td>Making it easier for you to keep your Orcid record up-to-date</td>
<td>Jisc Monitor</td>
<td>See above</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collection of data allowing librarians and research managers to monitor published articles, expenditure and compliance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supporting institutions to keep track of their researchers’ articles by taking advantage of the global Orcid initiative</td>
<td>Jisc/Arma Orcid pilot</td>
<td>See above</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ensuring efficient data flows across the system</td>
<td>RIOXX, Casrai</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>March: RIOXX EPprints plugin is ready to use</td>
<td>RIOXX, Casrai</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>June: RIOXX DSpace plugin will be ready</td>
<td>RIOXX metadata fields support RCUK compliance and some of the REF metadata requirements. Note that a REF plug-in is under development and the deadline for release is to be confirmed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>July: CASRAI OA working group will release a candidate profile for OA reporting, documenting UK funder reporting requirements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On someone downloading the article

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Usage reports for you as the article’s author (via your institutional repository)</th>
<th>Usage reports for articles authored from the institution</th>
<th>IRUS-UK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July: IRUS-UK and Core will have implemented technology to enable downloads from Core to be included in the reports for the repositories from which those items were harvested by Core</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benchmark usage figures across all participating institutions</td>
<td>1379 IRUS-UK usage data reports run last month by institutions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Past Events

University of Manchester (openWorks) Pathfinder project workshop workshop - 5 December 2014
Finding our way after Finch: lessons learned and where they lead
The openWorks project team draws together colleagues from a number of universities based in the north west with the aim of developing a regional community of good OA practice. The north west is home to various “categories” of university and the workshop provided a forum for gathering concerns as well as understanding strengths from each type. Workshop Report (bit.ly/1ITcuQj).

University of Glasgow (E2EOA) Pathfinder project workshop - 12 January 2014
Embedding future REF requirements
This all-day workshop looked at metadata requirements, processes, evidence and related issues for the next REF. Intended to be an interactive workshop, it brought together those interested in how we can use/develop/modify institutional systems (CRISs and/or IRs and/or other software) to manage the additional metadata requirements for the next REF. Workshop Report (bit.ly/1KowYCM).

Jisc Digifest: Jisc’s evolving offer to universities - 9 March
Uncovering researcher behaviours and engagement with OA
Last April the Hefce report Policy on Open Access in the Post-2014 REF (2014/7) highlighted the need for behaviour change if researchers are to engage with the OA agenda. This workshop highlighted ways in which these Pathfinder projects have encouraged behaviour change amongst researchers by implementing new techniques to embed culture change and improve services. More information will be available here (bit.ly/1BLLfQB) in due course.

UKSG: Working with OA offsetting deals - London - 27 May
This workshop explored how the Jisc offsetting agreements may impact on institutional workflows and what was necessary to embed them further.

Arma/Foster: OA: a good practice exchange - 19 March
This interactive workshop aimed to equip research managers and administrators with an understanding of tools to support the OA publication lifecycle and strategies to monitor and enhance institutional compliance and researcher engagement. More information (bit.ly/1Gttmgx).

UCL (Pathways to Open Access) Pathfinder project workshop - 20 March 2015
OA advocacy workshop: joining the dots
How do we communicate clear, consistent messages to researchers on the what, why and how of OA? This workshop, part of the UCL, Newcastle and Nottingham Jisc OA Pathfinder project, brought together representatives from institutions, publishers and funders to discuss best practice in communicating with authors and identify opportunities to develop a more joined-up approach to OA advocacy. Summary of the event (bit.ly/1F1wdI9).
Forthcoming events

Arma conference – Brighton- 3 June 11.15 - 12.30
Jisc OA Pathfinders: developing models of good practice for OA
This session will bring together several representatives from the Pathfinder projects and Jisc to report on progress so far across the programme, identifying key themes and issues and presenting practical outputs. Themes will include: cost management (e.g. mechanisms for recording APC and publication charge data, cost analysis of administrative effort on OA), advocacy (e.g. engaging with researchers through the publication process), workflows and technical enhancements (e.g. defining metadata standards for OA). We will also have a Q&A to discuss any issues participants may be facing, responding to the latest developments in this rapidly moving policy area.

Cern workshop on innovations in scholarly communication (OA19) - Geneva - June 17-19
Further information here (indico.cern.ch/event/332370/).

Repository Fringe- Edinburgh 3rd-4th August
Repository Fringe provides an annual forum for repository administrators, developers/coders, and information professionals to interact and explore the application of innovative technologies including cultural developments (such as research data management, principles and open data, social media, altmetrics) to their ongoing repository work in a relaxed and informal environment. (bit.ly/1AttpsO)

University of Hull (HHuLOA) Pathfinder workshop-National Railway Museum, York
How can open access support research development Given that open access is promoted as a means of increasing awareness of research outputs, and generate greater interest in the research of an institution, how might open access be able to contribute to the development of research? Where does open access sit within research strategy, and what place does it have in growing research income and reputation?

This event will encompass two parts dissemination of the work carried out by the HHuLOA project to date, and a workshop to explore how open access can support research development that is building on this work. Further details and registration: (bit.ly/1AvYefR)

Further Information

All information on the OA Good Practice initiative will be posted on the:

OA Good Practice blog (openaccess.jiscinvolve.org/wp/),
on the OA Good Practice twitter feed @OA_GoodPractice
and on OAGOODPRACTICE@jiscmail.ac.uk

In the meantime, please contact Sarah Fahmy (sarah.fahmy@jisc.ac.uk) with any comments or queries or if you want to be added to the Jiscmail list – always interested in hearing from you!

Other resources
First independent review (rcuk.ac.uk/media/news/openaccess/) of the implementation of the RCUK policy on OA

OpenAIRE pilot launched (bit.ly/1air7Qj):
Funding Open Access for Post-Grant FP7 Publications

The Copyright Clearance Centre (CCC) released the Making Open Access Work for Authors, Institutions, and Publishers (bit.ly/170s24) report which explores the ways in which authors, research institutions and publishers are grappling with the increasing move toward OA mandates by governments.
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