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Context

- Finch Group Reports 2012 and 2013
  - Universities UK OA Co-ordination Group
- funders and their policies:
  - Wellcome Trust, RCUK, HEFCE and other funding bodies
- publishers and their policies
- universities’ policies and responses
- researchers’ attitudes and behaviours
Funders and their policies

- **Wellcome Trust (and COAF)**
  - expectation of immediate OA; accessible via Europe PMC within 6 months; funds for payment of OA fees; CCBY licence where fee paid

- **RCUK**
  - preference for Gold OA; accessible via a repository within 6/12 months (STEM), or 12/24 months (HSS); block grants to universities to support Green and Gold; CCBY licence where OA fee paid

- **HEFCE and other funding bodies**
  - covers any article or conference proceeding published from 1 April 2016 and to be submitted to the next (2020?) REF; no preference or funding for Gold OA; deposit in and discoverability via a repository within 3 months of acceptance; accessible within 12 months (STEM), or 24 months (HSS); no preference for licence, but CCBY-NC-ND is OK

- **EU Horizon 2020**
  - no preference for Gold; deposit in a repository by date of publication; accessible within 6 months (STEM), or 12 months (HSS); funding for OA fees within duration of project; pilot on post-project funding for articles arising from FP7 projects
Publishers: 1

Publishing Models Available to Authors: Journal Types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Global Total (SCOPUS)</th>
<th>Journals in which UK Authors Publish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gold APC</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gold no APC</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hybrid</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
<td>49.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Delayed OA’</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscription-only</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total no. journals       | 21,741 | 22,486 | 13,411 | 13,585
• development of Green OA deposit, posting, ‘self-archiving’ (?) and embargo policies

• generally permissive for preprints, less so for ‘accepted manuscripts’ (AAMs), much less so for published Versions of Record (VoRs)

• similarly most permissive for postings on author websites, less so for institutional repositories, subject repositories, and least of all for commercial sites

• some policies difficult to find, and not infrequently difficult to interpret

• issues for publishers in development of new workflows
Universities

- Universities are developing policies
- Some support Gold, more tend to support Green
- Development of repositories
- Concerns about detail, about communications with researchers, and about complexity of workflows
- Critical support from Jisc in dealing with at least some of these issues
- Increasing interest in ‘moving upstream’
## Researchers’ take-up of OA publishing

### Take-up of Publishing Models: Articles Published

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Global Total of Articles (SCOPUS)</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>FWCI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gold APC</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gold no APC</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hybrid Gold</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Delayed OA’</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>1.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscription-only incl hybrid non-Gold</td>
<td>81.1%</td>
<td>78.0%</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Articles Published by UK Authors</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>FWCI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gold APC</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gold no APC</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hybrid Gold</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Delayed OA’</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>2.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscription-only incl hybrid non-Gold</td>
<td>76.4%</td>
<td>70.7%</td>
<td>1.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total no. articles               | 2,351,119 | 2,519,824 |
|                                  |           |           |
|                                  | 148,466   | 157,240   |
Researchers’ postings of articles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Version</th>
<th>Immediate OA (incl hybrid)</th>
<th>Delayed OA</th>
<th>Subscription</th>
<th>Total (all articles)</th>
<th>Total (all articles excl illicit)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preprint</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAM</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VoR</td>
<td>58.0%</td>
<td>39.8%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (de-duplicated for multiple versions)</td>
<td>61.6%</td>
<td>46.6%</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (excl illicit postings)</td>
<td>61.6%</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Researchers’ postings of articles: 2

UK Online postings by location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Article version</th>
<th>Share of postings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VoR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **VoR**
  - Other: 9.3%
  - Social Sharing Network: 44.1%
  - Subject Repository: 31.0%
  - Institutional Repository: 4.0%
  - Academic: 11.7%

- **AAM**
  - Other: 4.9%
  - Social Sharing Network: 56.6%
  - Subject Repository: 19.7%
  - Institutional Repository: 7.9%
  - Academic: 10.9%

- **PP**
  - Other: 5.8%
  - Social Sharing Network: 48.2%
  - Subject Repository: 23.2%
  - Institutional Repository: 6.8%
  - Academic: 16.1%
Overall OA take-up
Researchers (and others) as readers and users

- are OA articles used more than non-OA articles?
- views and downloads occur on an increasing range of sites........
- publisher data suggests more downloads for OA articles, but with huge variations between journals
- confirmed by data from Jisc’s Usage Statistics Portal
- downloads from UK IRs highly skewed and dwarfed by those from publishers and from PMC
- no data from sharing sites
- no definitive answer to the question until article-level download data made more openly available
Financial implications: 1

APC expenditure estimated at £33m across all UK universities in 2014, 6x higher than in 2012, with huge variations between universities.
Financial implications: 2

- huge variations in amounts paid

![Graph showing relationship between mean APC paid and citation impact of journal](image)

- Scatter plot with line of best fit:
  - Scatter points: data points for different institutions.
  - Line: linear relationship between mean APC paid and average FWCI.
  - Equation: $R^2 = 0.904$

- Box plot on the right side:
  - Comparison of mean APC paid across different institutions.
  - Institutions: UCL and Warwick.
Financial implications: 3

Subscription expenditure across all UK universities estimated at £135m, but huge variations in balance between APC and subscription expenditure, ranging from 1% to 39% across 24 universities, with an average of 14% (12% excluding UCL).
Financial implications: 4

- projections for the future?

- context of concerns about overall financial constraints on universities
- continuing increase in articles published
- static or rising APCs?
- static or rising preference for Gold?
- static or rising subscription costs?
- impact of offsetting?
Some conclusions

- funders, publishers, and universities have all promoted a significant shift towards OA
  - crucial support from bodies including Jisc and CrossRef
- take-up in the UK is significantly ahead of the world average, and growing fast: *a success*!
- but............
  - policies & requirements still inconsistent and confusing
  - workflows & service standards (*for all players*) are at best work in progress
  - researchers’ understanding is patchy
  - concerns about levels of compliance (but is it the right word?)
  - concerns and uncertainties about costs (for Green and Gold) are real
Some solutions?

- Tickell report to Ministers (February 2016)
  - continue current policies, with greater flexibility and some tweaking
    - harmonisation??
  - enhanced role for UUK Open Access Co-ordination Group, with sub-groups on
    - service standards
    - efficiency
    - repositories
    - monographs
  - development of good practice guides and codes
  - continued monitoring of progress: further report by end 2017
  - ‘working together to promote shared purpose and tackle challenges’
Questions and comments?
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