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In this Session

- Who are SHERPA
- The origins of Open Access
- Why institutional repositories & whom benefits?
- Embedding repositories through advocacy
- Services & Support for institutional repositories

Not Covering

- Detailed technical & implementation issues
- Open Access publishing
- Everything you’d ever want to know about Open Access

…but the booklet offers guidance on where to find out more

Who are SHERPA?
SHERPA

- Securing a Hybrid Environment for Research Preservation and Access (SHERPA Project)
  - Original project 2003-Jan 2006
- Now ongoing project based team
  - Funded by JISC, CURL, OSI, SPARK Europe, Wellcome
- Work activities include
  - Assisting in set up & develop of institutional repositories
  - Investigating related issues, disseminating experience & advice
  - All projects relate to scholarly publishing & Open Access
- Core team based at University of Nottingham, UK
  - Partner Officers based at UK Universities

SHERPA Project Activity

- Copyright, authors’ rights & IPR
  - JULIET, SHERPA/RoMEO
- Discovery & search services
  - OpenDOAR, Intute RS
- Preservation & long term access
  - SHERPA DP, PROSPERO & The Depot
- Repository development
  - DRIVER, EThOS, SHERPA Plus & Repositories Support Project

What is Open Access?
Open Access Defined

- A valuable research movement
  - An old tradition and a new technology have converged to make possible an unprecedented public good
  - ...we mean its free availability on the public internet, permitting any users to read, download, copy, distribute, print search or link to the full text of these articles, crawl them for indexing, pass as data to software, or use them for any other lawful purpose–Budapest Open Access Initiative (2002)
- In essence
  - Encourages a wider use of information assets and increases citations.
  - Open Access articles can be freely accessed by anyone in the world
  - Potential readership is far, far greater than full-text articles restricted to subscribers

Secret Origins

- Research is publicly funded
  - Supported by institutional infrastructure
  - Results only available outside of public domain
- Authors sign away rights with publishers in order to publish
  - Given away freely to publishers
  - Publishers make increasingly large profits selling material back
- No tangible reward for authors
  - Rights to reuse “own” material for colleagues, teaching etc lost
  - Academic community dissatisfied with status quo

Research Publishing Barriers

- Readership limited by economics
  - Journal prices rise as budgets fall
  - Potential global partnerships aborted
  - Inaccessible research
- Emerging Publisher monopolies
  - Eliminating competition
  - Squeezing smaller publishers
  - Resultant cancellation of smaller publisher titles to maintain major bundles
- Knock-on effects
  - Restriction on advancement of human knowledge
  - Library/Academic relationships soured

Open Access Repositories

- Online sites
  - Authors deposit scholarly publications
  - Sometimes called digital repositories
- Open Access repositories mean
  - Contents are freely available online to all
  - No subscription or registration to read
- Open Access repositories are not
  - A substitute for peer-reviewed publication
- Potential for value added services
  - Personalised publications lists, hit rates & citation analysis
- Sustainability built in
  - Repositories work towards continued format accessibility
The World of Open Access

• A Global movement
  – Projects & initiatives since the late 1990s
• UK Scene
  – 94 UK OA Repositories listed on OpenDOAR
  – Not an activity in isolation
  – Differing funding, staffing & policy models
• SHERPA Partners Experiences
  – Varied levels of support, discipline engagement and success
• Open Access is not just repositories
  – Open Access journals exist with very different funding models

Developing Landscape

• Funding mandates
  – RCUK (UK Research Councils)
  – Charities (e.g. Wellcome Trust, Arthritis Research Campaign)
• European Commission
  – ‘Study on the Economic and Technical Evolution of the Scientific Publication Markets of Europe’
  – Petition - 22,000 signatures
  – Funding DRIVER project
• The Guardian’s Free our data campaign

Why are Repositories Important & Whom Benefits?

http://www.sherpa.ac.uk

Publishing & Repositories

http://www.sherpa.ac.uk
**Why Institutional Repositories?**

- They have greater longevity
  - Institutions around for longer than individuals
  - JISC model favours them
- Subject repositories more at risk in the long term
  - From projects ending or individuals losing ability to support
  - Some subject repositories being adopted by institutions
- IRs allow easier management of intellectual assets
  - Allows co-ordinated approach to capture, storage and retrieval
  - Enables efficient use of research & beneficial collaboration
  - Provide readily reusable materials
- Practical reasons
  - Integration into workflows and systems
  - Support is close to academic users and contributors

**Repository Types**

- Institutional
- Disciplinary
- Aggregating
- Governmental
- Undetermined

**Repositories by Continent**

- Europe (432)
- North America (280)
- South America (27)
- Asia (25)
- Middle East (15)
- Central America (4)

**European Repositories**

- Germany (511)
- United Kingdom (195)
- Netherlands (164)
- France (152)
- Sweden (144)
- Spain (129)
- Belgium (64)
- Italy (62)
- Spain (62)
OA Research Benefits
• OARs enable a wider global readership
• Which means:
  - Improved citation rankings
  - Communication
  - Improved long term preservation
  - Decreased potential plagiarism
• Leading to:
  - Professional standings
  - Departmental & Institutional respect/promotion
  - Long term accessibility
  - Ease of access for colleagues and students

Broader Benefits
• For the institution
  - Facilitates use & re-use of information assets
  - Raises profile and prestige of institution
  - Potential long-term cost savings
• For the research community
  - Frees up the communication process
  - Avoids unnecessary duplication
  - Assists in truly global collaboration
• For society at large
  - Publicly-funded research publicly available
  - Aids in public understanding of research

Successfully Embedding an Institutional Repository through Advocacy

Why is Advocacy Key?
• To embed & enable your repository successfully
  - Cultural change must be achieved
  - Funding, staffing, ethos and policies must be agreed
• One of the most effective tools is advocacy
  - Getting the right message to the right people
  - Tone and content varied by target audience
• SHERPA Partner Experience
  - Based on discussions with SHERPA Partner Officers
  - Focused on advocacy successes & challenges
  - Each institution has different approaches
Advocating Repositories

• An informed awareness must be built
  – A core message & ethos is essential
  – Neglecting advocacy will result in repository decline
• Be prepared for knock-backs
  – Which can be somewhat forceful
• The right level of engagement is crucial
  – Not selling technical minutiae to ProVCs
  – Emotional & intellectual arguments

7 (& a bit) Advocacy Pillars

1. Set Achievable Targets
2. Discipline & Community
3. Educate & Clarify
4. Seize the Moment
5. Allies & Comparators
6. Enable Effective Deposition
7. Achieve Quick Wins
7.5…Challenges

7 (& a bit) Advocacy Pillars

1. Setting Achievable targets
  – Steering group comprised of key people
  – Focus on specific targets
2. Disciplinary Differences
  – Disciplinarily differences evident but not absolute
  – SHERPA Max:Min approach
  – Intra-institutional publication cultures will differ
  – Awareness of subject community differences
3. Educate & Clarify
  – Stakeholders will have many concerns and questions
  – SHERPA site offers guidance and suggested resolutions
  – What about a possible threat to journals?
4. Seize the Moment
  – Prepare and capitalise on serendipitous opportunities
  – Need marketing plan and core-message ready ASAP
  – Use in-house publications
7 (& a bit) Advocacy Pillars

5. Using Allies & Comparators
   - Take advantage of competitiveness
   - Comparators proved useful for SHERPA Partnership
   - Locate comparators using OpenDOAR
   - Customer satisfaction can be a significant driver

6. Enable Effective Deposition
   - Deposition is part of the publication process
   - Labour intensive methods can be useful
   - Self archiving, mediated deposit or blended approach
   - Departmental or institutional mandates

7. Achieving Quick Wins
   - Control the situation & stay on message
   - Explore metadata only repositories as a stepping stone
   - Enabling administrative staff to deposit
   - Keep academics engaged with wider debate

7.5...Facing the Challenges

• Advocacy fatigue
• Even slight barriers are enough
• Fixed term posts & funding
  - Worries for longevity of some repositories
  - High expectations for short timescale
• Real cultural change is a crucial achievable
  - But takes an uncertain amount of time and effort
• Unrealistic targets
  - Is it better to establish quality over quantity?
• Who does the work

Services & Support from SHERPA
OpenDOAR

- Quality assured directory of repositories
  - Lists 855 sites currently
  - Rated #1 in the world by Johns Hopkins University
- Service Scope
  - Only sites wholly embrace OA concept for full text
  - Sites with metadata only or access restrictions declined
- Harvesting
  - Data harvested manually & by machine
  - Human audit step
  - Provides wealth of data including information on contents, policies and contacts

OpenDOAR Tools

- OpenDOAR search
  - Powered by Google Custom Search Engine
  - Unlocks research in repositories
- Repository policy generator
  - Use standardised format to define policies
  - Aids impact & visibility of deposited research
- Email Distribution service
  - Community enhancement aid
- Application Programmers Interface (API)
  - m2m allowing external running of queries

SHERPA/RoMEO

- Highlights publisher’s archiving policies
  - 276 currently listed
- Green (36%)
  - Can archive both pre & post-prints
- Blue (28%)
  - Can archive post-print only
- Yellow (11%)
  - Can archive pre-print only
- White (27%)
  - Archiving not formally supported

Figures accurate as of April 2007

Quality assured by contacting publishers
Prohibitive restrictions reduce colour level
RoMEO Challenges

- No information online
  - Publisher reluctance or uncertainty
  - Not all respond ... a problem!
- Conflicting information
  - Two different sets of guidelines
  - Poorly phrased guidance
- Unclear boundaries
  - Common for learned societies using publishers
- Changes to publisher permissions
  - Try to keep site up to date
  - Some publisher rights change frequently
- Prototype API available
  - Allows reuse of data on repository sites

JULIET

- Companion service to RoMEO
- Information on Funder Mandates
  - Rated 0 – 3 Open Access “ticks”
  - Demonstrates funders’ support of OA
- Currently 20 funders listed
  - 11 UK & 2 Australian
  - 1 each Austria, France, Germany and USA
  - 3 (and 1 awaiting) from charities

UKCoRR

- UK Council of Research Repositories
  - Possible professional body for repository administrators
  - Practitioner based to share best practice
  - Independent of institutions or external funders
- Series of pre-launch workshops
  - Exploring potential role and initial challenges
- Launch at University of Nottingham 21st May
  - 50 representatives already attending
Conclusion

• Open Access is a global movement with benefits for researchers & institutions
• SHERPA has applied experience across its partnerships to develop useful guidance
• Advocacy has been the key to successful cultural change
• Appreciation of the unique research culture of the institution is vital
• Tools and services exist to assist scholars & repository workers
• Developing network of practitioners helped avoid error duplication