ROYAL HOLLOWAY
University of London

The attached Open Access Publications Policy (OAPP) document was approved by Academic Board in December 2009.

Minor amendments were made by the Open Access Publications Policy Advisory Group in March 2010. These largely consisted of stating that the planned implementation of the OAPP would now be September 2010 in order to coincide with the Research Information System; and some tighter definitions of terms.

A Royal Holloway Open Access Publications Policy

Summary

It is recommended that, copyright permissions allowing, the College should require that all of its research outputs be made freely accessible in the public domain via the College research repository (Royal Holloway Research Online) in order to:

a) maximise the visibility and impact of Royal Holloway research outputs,

b) meet the open access requirements of major research funding bodies for publicly-funded research to reach the widest possible audience.

c) ensure bibliographic details of all Royal Holloway research outputs are held centrally and thereby align the College with the likely requirements of REF.

d) reduce the dominance of publisher subscription-based journals and their impact on library budgets.

e) help ensure long-term preservation of the College's research record.

It is proposed that these objectives are best achieved through the creation, endorsement and implementation of a Royal Holloway Open Access Publications Policy detailed in Section 5 of this paper.

It is recommended that, championed by the Vice Principal (Research, Enterprise and Communications), an Advisory Group reporting to the Research Committee is established to oversee the implementation and evolution of the Policy and the Repository.

Final recommendations for the Policy should be presented to the Academic Board for approval in December 2009. The intention would be to launch the Policy at the beginning of the 2010/11 financial year.

1. Background

Recent publicity[1] surrounding UCL's Open Access Publications Policy provides an opportunity for the College to consider implementing one of its own. The Principal's Briefing Group in May 2009 approved an outline proposal from Library Services for such a policy, subject to formal endorsement through the requisite College committees. This paper sets out the rationale for, and detail of, such a policy. The proposals have been supported by the Research Committee and Faculty Boards at their October and November 2009 meetings, leading to final recommendations submitted to the Academic Board at its meeting on December 9th 2009.

2. Internal context

Since 2005 Library Services has been running the College's open access research archive, Royal Holloway Research Online (RHRO), originally developed under the aegis of the University of London's SHERPA-LEAP project[2]. This was set-up with an informal voluntary deposit arrangement heavily reliant on individual and departmental goodwill.

This approach had some limited initial success but interest in voluntary self-archiving in the College has dwindled over time. RHRO currently contains approximately 600 research

---

[1] UCL embraces open access with institution-wide mandate,
http://www.timeshighereducation.co.uk/story.asp?storycode=406832

[2] http://www.sherpa-leap.ac.uk/about.html

outputs accumulated over a period of 5 years. This total places us 65th out of 96 UK institutional repositories in the Registry of Open Access Repositories (ROAR) database[3]. As a comparator, the University of Cambridge repository has over 206,000 items and the University of Southampton just under 46,000.

Voluntary archiving policies alone are not likely to achieve significant full-text submission rate. For example, the Open University's Research Online repository has 11,000 repository records but only 22% of these have open access articles attached as there is no publications policy in place. Carr et. al. note that a 15% deposit rate is the norm for voluntary self-archiving repositories in institutions without publications policies in place, whereas 95% to 100% deposit rates after 2 years have been reported for institutions with self-archiving policies.[4]

Given the need to maximise the visibility and impact of Royal Holloway research outputs in the context of planning for the Research Excellence Framework (REF) and investment in a new Research Information System (RIS), it is an appropriate time for an Open Access Publications Policy to be established, incorporating an institutional requirement for the deposit of research outputs generated by Royal Holloway.

3. External context

There is significant external evidence to support the case for such a policy, for instance the latest statistics from ROMEO show that 97% of journal publishers accept some form of open access deposit for postprint or preprint versions[5].

Other UK HEIs that have adopted or are considering adopting such a policy include Aston, Edinburgh, Glasgow, Leicester, Roehampton, Salford, Southampton, Stirling, UCL, Westminster[6].

Successful open access eprint archives have been running in certain disciplines for many years alongside traditional scholarly publishing without jeopardising the system itself or the reputations of submitting authors. Examples include arXiv[7] in physics and CiteSeer[x 8] in computer science.

a. Funder requirements

Institutional engagement with open access is fast becoming a condition of obtaining research council funding. According to the SHERPA JULIET database [9], there are now 13 major UK funder open access mandates in place, including all 7 Research Councils. 9 institutional/departmental mandates are in place in the UK (including Edinburgh, Stirling, UCL and Westminster). It should also be noted that 5 funders have a data archiving requirement as well.

b. Reputational benefit

Evidence is starting to emerge to support the view that open access research has a higher citation impact compared to that of non-open access research. A 2006 cross-disciplinary analysis of articles published in 10 different disciplines over a 12 year period by Hajjem et. al. calculated an open access citation impact 36% to 172% higher than non-open access

---

[3] ROAR, http://roar.eprints.org/

[4] Carr, L., Swan, A., Sale, A., Oppenheim, C., Brody, T., Hitchcock, S., Hajjem, C. and Harnad, S. (2006) Repositories for Institutional Open Access: Mandated Deposit Policies. Available from: http://eprints.ecs.soton.ac.uk/13099/.

[5] ROMEO, Journal Policies: Summary Statistics, http://romeo.eprints.org/stats.php

[6] ROARMAP, http://www.eprints.org/openaccess/policysignup/

[7] Arxiv, http://www.arxiv.org/

[8] CiteSeer[x], http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/

[9] SHERPA JULIET, http://www.sherpa.ac.uk/juliet/index.php

material[10]. In many ways this is common sense – the more visible and accessible a piece of research is, the more likely it is to be found and used by researchers.

The so-called "Open Access (OA) Advantage" to the author and hence the author's institution has been summarised by Carr et. al. as comprising:

- Early Advantage (early self-archiving produces both earlier and more citations),
- Usage Advantage (more downloads for OA articles, correlated with later citations),
- Competitive Advantage (relative citation advantage of OA over non-OA articles),
- Quality Advantage (OA advantage is higher, the higher the quality of the article)
- Quality Bias (authors selectively self-archiving their higher quality articles).

c.   Economics

The economics of traditional scholarly publishing is making open access publishing an increasingly attractive option. From a library perspective, the cost of maintaining "just-in-case" journal subscriptions has risen exponentially in an increasingly monopolistic journal market. So-called "big deal" journal subscription packages have increased availability of journal articles but have reduced negotiation capacity. Open access publishing therefore offers a cheaper alternative to expose institutional research to the widest possible audience. This is confirmed in a recent report by the Research Information Network (RIN) which calculated that the average publishing and distribution cost of a traditional journal article is £4000 and that moving to a 90% open-access scholarly publishing model cost would cut such costs by nearly 50%. UK HE libraries would benefit from a saving of £128 million in subscription fees although this would be offset by increases in author publication fees. [11]

4.   Policy implementation

The intention would be to launch the Policy proposed in Section 5 to coincide with the roll-out of the College's new Research Information System (RIS) in 2010 and the redesign of the architecture of the College website. The start of the financial year 2009/10 (September 1st 2010) is proposed as the implementation date.

It is proposed that an Advisory Group reporting to the Research Committee should be established once the Policy has gained formal approval with the remit to advise on (and monitor) implementation of the Policy and development of the Repository. The Board should comprise representative membership from the following areas (with roles clearly defined) and be chaired by the Vice Principal (Research, Enterprise and Communications):

- Professoriat
- Deans or Heads of Department
- IT Department
- Library Services
- Research & Enterprise Office
- Strategy Unit

The launch of the Policy would be accompanied by an advocacy campaign and publication of a series of FAQs, modelled on existing examples, e.g., Edinburgh University.

---

[10] C. Hajjem, S.Harnad and Y.Gingras (2006), Ten-Year Cross-Disciplinary Comparison of the Growth of Open Access and How it Increases Research Citation Impact, IEEE Data Engineering Bulletin 28(4): 39-47; 2005. Available from: http://arxiv.org/abs/cs/0606079v2.

[11] RIN (2008), Activities, costs and funding flows in the scholarly communications system in the UK. Available from: http://www.rin.ac.uk/system/files/attachments/sarah/Activites-costs-flows-report.pdf

5. Draft Policy

A proposed Policy is detailed below, the content and wording of which has been based on the original University of Stirling Publications Policy with some additional sections.[12]

With reference to the Scope, a phased implementation may be necessary, commencing with peer-reviewed research outputs.

With reference to Copyright, the roles and responsibilities relating to copyright clearance need to be clearly defined.

With reference to the preservation of research outputs and the security of the repository, policy guidelines need to be defined and best practice assured.

The post of Repository Officer, referred to in the text, is a new professional post that would be required to implement the Policy, based in Library Services. A job profile has been drawn up identifying the roles and responsibilities of this post.

Royal Holloway, University of London: Open Access Publications Policy

Royal Holloway, University of London:

- supports the principles of the Berlin Declaration on Open Access to Knowledge in the Sciences and Humanities[13] that the outcomes of publicly funded research should be made available as widely as possible.

- welcomes moves by Research Councils to promote unrestricted access to the published output from the research they fund.

- aims to maximise the visibility, citation, usage and impact of the College's research output by maximising online access to it for all would-be users and researchers worldwide.

- aims to minimise the effort that individual members of the University must expend in order to provide open online access to their research output.

- requires all researchers[14] to submit copies of their research output, after it has been accepted as suitable for publication, to the Royal Holloway Institutional Repository (http://eprints.rhul.ac.uk) from September 1st 2010. Alternatively, subject to consideration by the Advisory Group, a first phase could apply to work written after September 2010. The process of self-archiving will be supported by Library Services.

Attribution of institutional research

1. A standard address convention will be used on all Royal Holloway originated research outputs to ensure that all institutional research is cited (and therefore counted) consistently and unambiguously as Royal Holloway research. This convention will be:

Royal Holloway, University of London

---

[12] White Michael (2008), STORRE press release and policy. SPARC-OA Forum@arl.org Mailing List Archive. Accessed from: https://arl.org/lists/sparc-oaforum/Message/4303.html

[13] Open Access Conference – Berlin Declaration, http://oa.mpg.de/openaccess-berlin/berlindeclaration.html

[14] A 'Researcher' will be defined as 'any member of Royal Holloway (including honorary College staff and students) involved in research activities and producing research outputs.' [Agreed at OAPPAG March 2010]

Consistency of Royal Holloway branding and presentation are also recommended.

Scope

1. This policy will apply to all peer-reviewed research outputs including, but not restricted to, journal articles, conference papers and book chapters.

2. Electronic thesis (e-thesis) submission will have its own separate process although e-theses themselves will form part of the Institutional Repository.

3. Research datasets are to be archived with accompanying outputs in the Institutional Repository as funder requirements dictate.

4. Non-peer reviewed output including, but not restricted to, reports, working papers, presentations and speeches will be deposited in the College's Research Information System so that third-stream work can be identified and promoted by the College where third-party contracts allow.

Submission Policy - concerning depositors, quality & copyright

1. Items may only be deposited by accredited members of the institution, or their nominated delegates.

2. Authors may only submit their own work for archiving (including co-authored papers).

3. Items are to be submitted immediately upon acceptance for publication.

4. The author's final accepted draft should be submitted (post-print version). Submission of this version complies with the policies of the majority of publishers. Where publisher conditions allow, or require it, the publishers own version, or an author's pre-refereed draft (pre-print version), will be accepted.

5. Authors who wish to disseminate a version of their research output via subject repositories prior or as an alternative to print publication should ensure that a copy of the version is submitted simultaneously to the Repository.

6. Items must be submitted in Adobe Acrobat Portable Document Format (pdf), or, where appropriate, an alternative format as agreed by the Repository Officer, especially with regard to research datasets. Publisher pdfs should not be submitted unless there is an explicit requirement from the publisher for the author to do so.

7. The Repository Officer will vet items for the eligibility of authors/depositors, relevance to the scope of the Repository, valid layout & format, and the exclusion of spam. Publisher policies will also be checked to ensure compliance.

8. The validity and authenticity of the content of submissions is the sole responsibility of the depositor.

9. Items will not be made publicly visible until the item has been published, and until any publishers' or funders' embargo period has expired.

10. All deposited items will contain any acknowledgements and links to publisher versions as specified by publisher policies; the Repository Officer will ensure these are added as required.

11. Any copyright violations contained within items are entirely the responsibility of the authors/depositors.

12. If the College receives proof of copyright violation, the relevant item will be removed immediately by the Repository Officer.

Compliance with Publisher and Research Funder Policies

1. Our policy is compatible with publishers' copyright agreements as follows:

- For all submitted items the Repository Officer will check the Publisher's policy. Most policies are documented via the SHERPA/ROMEO database[15] and Library Services will use this as a major support tool.

- Many publishers will allow the peer-reviewed final draft to be self-archived, often specifying that a specific acknowledgement be used along with the self-archived item. The Repository Officer will ensure any such acknowledgements are included in the Repository.

- Occasionally publishers allow their own final pdf version to be self-archived, in these instances the Repository Officer will contact the submitter to ask for the appropriate item version.

- Occasionally publishers will not allow either the author's own final, post refereed version or the publisher's version to be self-archived. In these instances the Repository Officer will contact the submitter to inform them, and, if appropriate, recommend that the author's preprint version (pre-refereed version) can be submitted instead if desired by the author.

2. For all submitted items, where Research Funder information is supplied, the Repository Officer will check the Research Funder's policies as regards ensuring Open Access to research results and publications arising from their funding. Policies are documented via the SHERPA/JULIET data base (Research Funders Archiving Mandates and Guidelines[16]) and Library Services will use this as a major support tool. Where possible, the Repository Officer will fulfil any archiving requirements on behalf of the submitting author, or alternatively inform them of what they need do to fulfil the conditions of funding.

Compliance with embargoes

1. Some work cannot be made available on open access at once, for a number of possible reasons, including but not limited to:

- Embargo periods imposed by the publisher of the work
- Patent applications involving all or some elements of the work
- Potential commercial publication or other exploitation of the work, including contractual restrictions imposed by commercial research sponsors
- Confidentiality of private information in the work which cannot be adequately anonymised or disguised, and for which permission of the persons concerned has not been given

---

[15] SHERPA/ROMEO, http://www.sherpa.ac.uk/romeo.php

[16] SHERPA/JULIET, http://www.sherpa.ac.uk/juliet/index.html

- Potential endangerment of researchers by wider availability of the work, for example from animal rights or religious extremists
- Potential breaches of public law in a country with which the researcher has dealings

2. Whatever embargoes are required, the work should still be submitted to the Repository, to ensure that it is safely preserved, together with a justification and supporting evidence from the author for enforcing such an embargo.

3. Requests for embargoes of up to five years will be accepted without question, unless in conflict with Research Funder requirements. Requests for longer embargoes than this will be discussed with the author, and may be referred to the Vice Principal (Communications, Research & Enterprise).

4. The Repository Officer will report to the author any cases where their embargo requests would place them in conflict with the requirements of their Research Funder but any negotiation with the Research Funder to permit an exception will be the responsibility of the author.

5. In the absence of permission from the Research Funder, the Researcher Funder requirement will take precedence over any request for an embargo.

Preservation Policy

1. Items will be retained indefinitely.

2. Library Services and the IT Department will work together try to ensure continued readability and accessibility.

3. Items may be migrated to new file formats where necessary.

4. It may not be possible to guarantee the readability of some unusual file formats.

5. Library Services and the IT Department will ensure that Repository files are backed regularly according to current best practice for critical information systems.

6. The original bit stream is retained for all items, in addition to any upgraded formats.

7. Items may not normally be removed from the Royal Holloway Research Repository. However, acceptable reasons for withdrawal include:

- Journal publishers' rules
- Proven copyright violation or plagiarism
- Legal requirements and proven violations
- National Security
- Falsified research
- At the College's discretion

8. Withdrawn items are not deleted per se, but are removed from public view. The metadata will be visible, but not searchable.

9. Items will be deleted from the Repository if there is a legal requirement to do so, or if it is deemed by the College to be in its best interests. Deletion of items will mean removal of the item itself, plus any metadata.

10. Changes to deposited items are not permitted.

11. If necessary, an updated version may be deposited. The earlier version may be withdrawn from public view at the Repository Officer's discretion.

12. In the event of the College Repository being closed down, the database will be transferred to another appropriate archive.

Review of policy and compliance with policy

1. This policy should be launched with a clear message of compliance from the Vice Principal (Research, Enterprise and Communications).

2. This policy will be reviewed by the College's Research Committee after one year and then at regular intervals agreed by the Research Committee

3. Annual academic appraisal should include a review of individual researcher engagement with the policy based on the research outputs generated during the appraisal period.

John Tuck, Tim Wales & Jonathan Pymm. Revised in the light of points raised at Research Committee, Faculty Boards and the Open Access Publications Policy Advisory Group. March 29th 2010.