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Project summary

The project aimed to develop a North West community of practice for Open Access Publishing support, building on Manchester’s successful service implementation during the first year of the UK Research Council’s (RCUK) compliance requirements and block grant funding. Project objectives included developing and adapting guidelines to meet the varying needs of local universities, to reduce the burden of compliance whilst maintaining research excellence. The proximity of the institutions involved was expected to foster community building, and although the project had a regional focus the outputs created were made openly available for reuse by the wider Open Access support community.

The project realigned its objectives in 2015 to address two new areas which had emerged from workshops organised by Jisc, whilst continuing to support development of a regional community of Open Access support practice. The new areas were concerned with benchmarking Open Access support services and the ‘approaches to deposit’ that institutions had in place to support the implementation of the Higher Education Funding Council for England’s (HEFCE) new Open Access policy, which affects submissions to the next Research Excellence Framework (REF). The intention was to produce a report that would include examples of Open Access support services, to help institutions considering increasing their resource, and provide a clearer understanding of the costs and benefits of the different deposit workflow models in place to support institutional compliance with HEFCE’s Open Access policy.
Main body of report

The project aimed to develop a North West community of practice for Open Access Publishing support, building on Manchester’s successful service implementation during the first year of RCUK compliance requirements and block grant funding, and create a template for community building that could be replicated in other geographic areas.

Project Aims

The aim of the original project plan was:

- To share good practice case studies and establish widely applicable and reusable toolkits, allowing a variety of HEIs to build services, manage processes and meet funder requirements.
- To develop a North West community of Open Access practice

Further aims were added to the project plan following realignment in 2015:

- To provide an overview of the costs and effectiveness of a range of deposit workflows, allowing HEIs to assess the most appropriate model.
- To outline the make-up and responsibilities of a number of Open Access support services, allowing HEIs to assess the appropriate level of resource required to meet their local objectives and the likely cost.

Project Objectives

The original project plan aimed to develop expertise and streamline Open Access workflows by:

- Producing a 2013/14 case study during year one of the project.
  - Project partners carried out Open Access baselining case studies which informed the 2014 workshop and the toolkit.
- Organising 2 workshops with speakers from libraries, publishing and research support offices.
  - Workshops were held in December 2014 and March 2016 and provided opportunities for representatives from North West institutions to share Open Access experiences and challenges. Feedback informed plans to realise project objectives.
- Hosting an Open Access conference with an open call for papers and keynote speakers in year 2 of the project (costs to be shared between Jisc project funds and Manchester, and other funding sources explored such as sponsorship).
  - Changes in the Open Access landscape and funding situation meant that this objective was not met.
- Producing a toolkit on funding policy and compliance.
  - The toolkit produced focussed on the needs of new Open Access support staff in smaller institutions.
- Producing a toolkit on the monitoring of research activity to be shared and developed during the project.
  - Realignment of the project prevented the delivery of this toolkit.
- Producing a final report at the end of year 2.
This document is the final project report.

- Disseminating results and outputs through a range of media and face to face events (e.g. conferences, blog, articles, Twitter).
  - Project results and outputs have been shared via the openNWorks project blog (https://blog.openworks.library.manchester.ac.uk/), Twitter (@h_j_dobson; #openworks), LinkedIn, email lists and at 3 workshops – Manchester NoWAL Open Access workshop (March 2016), Northern Collaboration Open Access workshop (May 2016), Manchester Pathfinder Summer Series (July 2016)
- Reporting on the regional approach to community building, as a potential way forward for OA Good Practice.
  - This has not been completed due to the limited success in developing a regional Open Access community.

The original objectives were reviewed throughout the first year of the project to ensure ongoing relevance and the best use of project resource. Following analysis of the project partner case studies, the launch of NoWAL’s regional network for research support staff, feedback from the workshop held in December 2014 and discussion with Jisc, the project realigned in 2015.

Additional objectives addressed two new areas which had emerged from workshops organised by Jisc, although the project continued to support development of a regional community of Open Access support practice in its second year. The revised project plan aimed to report on ‘approaches to deposit’ and benchmark Open Access services by producing case studies of various institutions.

**Methodology**

The project used the following methods to gather and/or present information:

- Baselining case study template
- Workshop activities
- Evaluation of case studies and workshop feedback
- Semi-structured interviews
- Questionnaire
- Approaches to deposit case study template

**Evaluation**

To measure the reach of the project and engagement with the outputs we invited feedback on a draft version of the toolkit, collected feedback from workshops and online discussion lists and, for online resources, gathered usage data using Google Analytics. Data analysis informed the direction of the project, highlighting unanticipated needs and evidencing low levels of engagement with the notion of an Open Access community. For further details see the ‘What did you learn?’ section.
Project outputs and outcomes

Please list all of the outputs and outcomes that your project has created, this should include tangible deliverables (including reports) and the less tangible knowledge and experience you hope to build and share. If useful for the readers, please categorise the outputs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Output / Outcome Type</th>
<th>Brief Description and URLs (where applicable)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Case studies</td>
<td>Open Access baselining case studies for project partners (<a href="http://find.jorum.ac.uk/resources/10949/19764">http://find.jorum.ac.uk/resources/10949/19764</a>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Summary of workshop held in December 2014 (<a href="http://find.jorum.ac.uk/resources/10949/19344">http://find.jorum.ac.uk/resources/10949/19344</a>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toolkit</td>
<td>A guide to Open Access for support staff (<a href="http://find.jorum.ac.uk/resources/10949/20126">http://find.jorum.ac.uk/resources/10949/20126</a>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case studies</td>
<td>Summary of deposit workflows at various UK universities (&lt;<a href="http://find.jorum.ac.uk/resources/%E2%80%A6%E2%80%A6%E2%80%A6%7D">http://find.jorum.ac.uk/resources/………}</a>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Summary of the deposit workflow models in place across the UK and their potential cost, and of Open Access support services at a small number of UK institutions (&lt;<a href="http://find.jorum.ac.uk/resources/%E2%80%A6%E2%80%A6%E2%80%A6%7D">http://find.jorum.ac.uk/resources/………}</a>)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What did you learn?

1. Although the project organised workshops that were attended by representatives from across the North West region, the level of engagement with discussions within workshops and outside of formal events suggests that geographical proximity alone is not sufficient to foster an active community. Analysis of case studies of project partners (<http://find.jorum.ac.uk/resources/10949/19764>) highlighted differences between institutions which suggested the need for support from beyond the region. The lack of engagement with an online forum to discuss Open Access issues with North West colleagues suggests that existing support channels are sufficient to meet the needs of most institutions.
Common practical experiences, eg, difficulties with repository software or the challenges of Open Access payments at differing scales, appear to be key factors in forming successful networks. Feedback from 2014 workshop highlighted the benefits of discussing Open Access with institutions with a similar profile (http://find.jorum.ac.uk/resources/10949/19344). In the North West, the more general Research Support network set up in 2014 by the North West Consortium of Academic Libraries (NoWAL) may be of more value than a community built specifically around Open Access good practice.

2. Open Access guidance materials for new support staff were initially perceived to be of value to smaller institutions, ie, with one or less FTE staff dedicated to Open Access support. However, verbal feedback at workshops in York and Manchester medium and large research-intensive universities indicated that such a guide would be useful more widely if maintained.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Months and Years</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>Mar</th>
<th>Apr</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>Jun</th>
<th>Jul</th>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>Sep</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Dec</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of views of Toolkit for Open Access Support Staff via openWorks project blog

Number of page views of Toolkit for Open Access Support Staff via www.openworks.online

3. While the timing of the investigation into the deposit models in place at various institutions meant that it was not possible to recommend the ‘best’ model in advance of the launch of the HEFCE REF Open Access policy, the data from interviews and a questionnaire suggested that models in place were those that were most appropriate within their own institutional context, based on the level of support staffing and/or well-established repository systems and workflows, and that models would continue to evolve. (URL FOR REPORT ON DEPOSIT APPROACHES TO ADD WHEN ANGELA PROVIDES IT)
4. The estimated costs of the deposit workflows were found to be significantly lower than previous suggestions for Green Open Access workflows\(^1\). ([URL FOR REPORT ON DEPOSIT APPROACHES TO ADD WHEN ANGELA PROVIDES IT])

5. Limited resource prevented the project carrying out a large-scale benchmarking exercise on Open Access support services.

Impact

Immediate impact

- The project raised the profile of Jisc's Open Access activities across the North West region, evidenced by attendance at workshops, feedback indicating the value of quarterly digests and institutions signing up to the Open Access Good Practice mailing list.

- Project activities have helped the recently formed NoWAL Research Support network become more established.

- The toolkit and report produced are of value across the sector. Feedback at workshops and download figures indicate that the toolkit’s guide for new Open Access support staff has been used in staff training at a number of UK institutions. The final output was released in July so it is too early to evaluate the immediate impact. Feedback from workshops suggests that the project outputs provide a firm foundation to build on at a later stage.

Future impact

- To be of ongoing value, the toolkit’s guide for new Open Access support staff needs to be updated by the community.

- Workshop feedback identified a desire for at least annual workshops to discuss progress in Open Access support across the North West region.

Conclusions

- The level of engagement with discussions within workshops and outside of formal events suggests that geographical proximity alone is not sufficient to foster an active community. Existing Open Access communication and support channels appear to be sufficient to meet the needs of most institutions.
- The UK Open Access community recognise the value of general Open Access training materials for new support staff.
- Deposit workflows in support of the HEFCE Open Access policy continue to evolve. The effectiveness of existing models is currently being evaluated and most institutions expect to refine their workflows in the 2016-17 policy year.
- Deposit workflows currently in place appear to be less costly per paper than indicated by previous research.
- The number of staff in Open Access support roles and their responsibilities vary between institutions of differing research profile, but also between institutions with similar research profiles.
- Open Access support services remain vulnerable with a number of institutions relying on fixed term posts.

Recommendations

- Maintain a toolkit for new Open Access support staff [See ‘What did you learn?’ Point 2]
- Review deposit workflows in early 2017 [See ‘What did you learn?’ Point 3]
- Carry out a wider review of Open Access support services [See ‘What did you learn?’ Point 5]
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Appendix 1

Template for ‘Approaches to Deposit’ case studies

1. Type of institution
2. Number of research staff
3. Number of research papers per year
4. Repository software
5. Who manages repository?
6. Number and grade of staff in repository team
7. Other repository support?
8. Governance of repository and OA policy implementation
9. Institutional OA policy
10. Deposit workflow
11. Role of support staff in deposit workflow
12. Rationale for deposit workflow
13. Tested prior to implementation?
14. Monitoring and reporting plans
15. Success criteria for approach
16. Estimated cost to institution
17. Communication and advocacy for approach
Appendix 2

Approaches to Deposit workflow survey

The opeNWorks project is seeking information about the deposit workflows in place to support institutional compliance with the HEFCE/REF OA policy.

Key to terminology:

Delegate is used in the survey to describe a PA or other individual who acts on behalf of an individual researcher.

School/department administrators in this context are roles (specially created or existing roles) that have responsibility for carrying out OA deposits for a whole school or department.

1) This question is about the quantity of papers your deposit workflow needs to accommodate.

   a. How many research papers does your institution produce each year that will be affected by the HEFCE/REF OA policy?
      • 100-250
      • 250-500
      • 500-750
      • 750-1000
      • More than 1000
      • Don’t know

   b. If you have selected a figure, is this an estimate?
      • Yes
      • No

2) This question is about the deposit workflow at your institution. Please select all the elements that best describe the deposit workflow you have in place to meet the HEFCE/REF OA requirements.

   a. Stage 1.
      • Author creates publication record and deposits their manuscript
      • Delegate creates publication record and deposits their manuscript on behalf of individual author
      • School/Departmental administrators create publication records and deposit manuscripts on behalf of all authors within the School/Department
      • Author submits publication metadata and manuscript to institutional Open Access/repository team which creates publication record and deposits manuscript
- Institutional OA/repository support staff harvest records from other repositories (if so, which repositories?)
- Other (please describe)
- Any other comments

b. Stage 2.
- OA/repository support staff check accuracy of publication metadata
- OA/repository support staff enhance publication metadata
- OA/repository support staff request that submitting author enhances publication metadata
- OA/repository support staff ensure publication metadata is displayed in line with internal house style
- OA/repository support staff confirm submitted manuscript can be deposited
- OA/repository support staff set indefinite embargo unless paper is Gold OA
- OA/repository support staff check and set embargo period for all papers
- OA/repository support staff check and set embargo period only if publication date is known
- OA/repository support staff check if paper is subject to OA policies of other funders and ensure compliance with all policies
- OA/repository support staff make all publication records open
- OA/repository support staff make publication record open only if paper has been published
- OA/repository support staff report publications that do not meet HEFCE/REF policy requirements as exceptions as appropriate
- OA/repository support staff set up publication alerts for accepted papers
- OA/repository support staff create internal mechanism to monitor publication of accepted papers
- Other (please describe)
- Any other comments

c. Stage 3.
- On publication, author updates metadata
- On publication, author’s delegate updates metadata
- On publication, School/Departmental administrator updates metadata
- On publication, OA/repository support staff update metadata
- On publication, author sets embargo period
- On publication, author’s delegate sets embargo period
- On publication, School/Departmental administrator sets embargo period
- On publication, OA/repository support staff set embargo period
- On publication, OA/repository support staff make publication record open for all papers
- On publication, OA/repository support staff make publication record open for papers subject to pre-publication metadata embargo
- Other (please describe)
- Any other comments
3) This question is about what is required by authors and their delegates in the deposit workflow.

- What metadata do you require authors to provide when creating a publication record in your deposit workflow?
  - Author list
  - Article title
  - Journal name
  - Acceptance date
  - Publisher
  - Publication date (if known)
  - DOI (if known)
  - Grant acknowledgements
  - Other
  - Any other comments

4) This question is about tasks in the workflow beyond validation of deposits.

- Does your workflow include any of the following:
  - Addition of publication coversheet including statement on Creative Commons licence
  - Addition of publication coversheet including statement required by publisher
  - Addition of publication coversheet including standard statement based on statements required by publishers
  - Option to obtain payment of APC
    - If yes, does the author request Gold OA? Y/N
    - If yes, do OA/repository support staff request Gold OA for eligible papers? Y/N
  - Anything else
  - Any other comments

5) This question is about compliance reporting in the deposit workflow.

a) Does your workflow include creation of compliance reports?
   - Yes
   - No

b) If yes, who do you produce the reports for?
   - OA/repository support staff/manager
   - Institutional research office
- Institutional REF team
- Faculty senior research staff/senior staff with OA responsibility
- Faculty research administrators
- School/Department Research Directors
- School/Department research administrators
- Other
- Any other comments

6) This question is about the evaluation of your deposit workflow.

- Are you monitoring the effectiveness of your workflow?
  - Yes
  - No

7) This question is about the OA/repository support team directly involved in the deposit workflow.

a) How many FTE posts do you have to support the deposit workflow? Please provide your answer in Arabic numbers.

b) How many staff members make up the number of FTE posts? Please provide your answer in Arabic numbers.

8) This question is about the grade of staff directly involved in supporting the deposit workflow.

a) Please select the pay band of staff working on validating publication records.
  - Up to £20,000 pa
  - Up to £25,000 pa
  - Up to £30,000 pa
  - More than £30,000 pa

b) Are staff working on validating publication records employed on permanent contracts?
  - Yes
  - No
  - Any other comments
9) This question is about the time taken to make a problem-free paper deposited compliant with the HEFCE/REF OA policy.

- How many minutes does it take to manage a standard, problem-free paper in your workflow so that it complies with the HEFCE/REF OA policy?

10) This question is about the effectiveness of your deposit workflow.

- Are you confident that your workflow can achieve institutional compliance with the HEFCE/REF OA policy?
  - Yes
  - No – If no, what will you do to improve the compliance level?
# Budget report

The University of Manchester Library  
Budget Report for the 3 years ended May16  
FA02808 JISC Pathfinder Grant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13/14</td>
<td>Staff Costs</td>
<td>13,333.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14/15</td>
<td>Staff Costs</td>
<td>13,333.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/16</td>
<td>Staff Costs</td>
<td>11,754.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Event Costs 27th June 2016</td>
<td>1,502.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Web Hosting &amp; Domain Name</td>
<td>76.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>40,000.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>