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Overview

• The new policy comes into effect from April 1st 2016, though HEFCE encourages adoption ASAP. It requires exactly the same initial steps as the College’s “Immediate Deposit/Optional Access” mandate, however, it goes further in specifying discoverability and accessibility criteria. It only applies to outputs, not impact case studies.
Definition of outputs within the scope of this policy

• a. journal article or a conference proceeding with an International Standard Serial Number (ISSN).

• b. output is accepted for publication after 1 April 2016.

• Any output that fits both aspects of this definition will need to meet the open access criteria.
What about the rest?

• ‘Outputs that sit outside the above definition will still be eligible for submission to the post-2014 REF without needing to meet the open access criteria. Specifically, this policy does not apply to monographs and other long-form publications, or to non-text outputs, or to the data which underpin some research. Further, this policy does not apply to those particular output types that are delivered confidentially for security or commercial reasons.’
Exclusions

- Monographs, chapters and other long-form publications
- Conference proceedings published with an International Standard Book Number (ISBN) or as part of a book series with an ISSN (i.e. book series with both an ISBN and ISSN such as Lecture Notes in Computer Science are excluded).
- Working papers
- Creative outputs (Novels, poetry etc.)
- Practical outputs
- Data
But encouragement to include as much as possible

- ‘Where a higher education institution (HEI) can demonstrate that it has taken steps towards enabling open access for outputs outside the scope of this definition, credit will be given in the research environment component of the post-2014 REF.’
Criteria for OA

• Outputs that meet the definition ... and thus fall within the scope of this policy, must fulfil all of the following criteria to be treated as open-access, except where there is an allowable exception. The criteria consist of:
  – deposit requirements
  – discovery requirements
  – access requirements.
Deposit requirements

- The output must have been deposited in an institutional repository, or a subject repository.
- The output must have been deposited as soon after the point of acceptance as possible, and no later than three months after this date (as given in the acceptance letter or e-mail from the publication to the author).
- The output must have been deposited as the author’s accepted and final peer-reviewed text (which may otherwise be known as the ‘accepted author manuscript’ or ‘final author version’ or ‘post-print’), though this may be replaced or augmented with an updated peer-reviewed manuscript or the final published version of record at a later date.
- Outputs that have been provisionally accepted for publication, under the condition that the author makes revisions to the manuscript that result from peer review, are not considered as the final text.
- Outputs that are published by a journal or conference that does not require peer review are within the scope of this policy; in this instance, we would require the author’s final accepted version.
Discovery requirements

• The output must be presented in a way that allows it to be discovered by readers and by automated tools such as search engines.

• The discovery requirements should typically be fulfilled through the storage and open presentation of a bibliographic or metadata record in the repository.

• Once discoverable, the output should remain so.

• Where a deposited output is later replaced or augmented with an updated peer-reviewed manuscript or the version of record, this must also meet the discovery requirements.
Access requirements

• The output must be presented in a form that allows anyone with internet access to search electronically within the text, read it and download it without charge, while respecting any constraints on timing.

• While we do not request that outputs are made available under any particular licence, we advise that outputs licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution Non-Commercial Non-Derivative (CC BY-NC-ND) licence would meet this requirement.

• Once accessible, the output should remain so.
Embargoes

- Publisher embargoes can be respected by locking the full-text. This means authors must still deposit a metadata record with a full-text file in the repository.
- HEFCE define the embargo start date as that of first publication (including online).
- The full-text must be made Open Access no more than one month after the embargo ends.
- If there is no embargo, full-text must be Open Access no more than one month after live deposit.
- Ongoing embargoes do not prevent REF submission, provided that the date of their first publication is within the REF publication period.
- Embargo dates should not be reset if the Published Draft replaces the Author’s Accepted Draft.
Embargo lengths

• Embargo periods should not exceed the following maxima:
  – 12 months for REF Main Panel A and REF Main Panel B
  – 24 months for REF Main Panel C and REF Main Panel D
  – Interdisciplinary research being submitted to Main Panel A or B that would be also admissible to Main Panel C or D may respect the longer of the two embargo periods.
Text-mining

• Outputs do not need to allow automated tools to perform in-text search and download (text-mining), but credit will be given in the Research Environment component of the REF submission where this is demonstrated.
Exceptions

• There are instances when an output will be considered beyond the scope of the policy. These exceptions should be noted in the REF submission for that output. If a submitted output fails to comply for reasons not covered in the exceptions, HEFCE will require a short written explanation.

• Three types of exception: deposit, access, technical.
Deposit exceptions

- The following exceptions deal with cases where the output is unable to meet the deposit requirements. The output will not be required to meet any of the open access criteria, and should be considered beyond the scope of this policy, though we recognise that in some cases open access to the output may be achievable at a later date or by another route.
  - The individual whose output is being submitted to the REF was unable to secure the use of a repository at the point of acceptance. (May apply to staff arriving from institutions without an IR, and for whom there is no appropriate subject repository.)
  - The individual whose output is being submitted to the REF experienced a delay in securing the final peer-reviewed text (for instance, where a paper has multiple authors).
  - The individual whose output is being submitted to the REF was not employed by a UK HEI at the time of submission for publication.
  - It would be unlawful to deposit, or request the deposit of, the output.
  - Depositing the output would present a security risk.
Access exceptions

• The following exceptions deal with cases where deposit of the output is possible, but there are issues to do with meeting the access requirements. The output will still be required to meet the deposit and discovery requirements, but not the access requirements. A closed-access deposit will be required, and the open access requirements should be met as soon as possible.
  – The output depends on the reproduction of third party content for which open access rights could not be granted (either within the specified timescales, or at all). (Potentially more likely in subjects like History of Art.)
  – The publication concerned requires an embargo period that exceeds the stated maxima, and was the most appropriate publication for the output.
  – The publication concerned actively disallows open-access deposit in a repository, and was the most appropriate publication for the output.
Technical exceptions

• The following exceptions deal with cases where an output is unable to meet the criteria due to a technical issue. The output will not be required to meet the open access criteria. We would strongly urge HEIs to ensure the criteria are met retroactively, as soon as possible and no later than the REF submission point.
  – At the point of acceptance, the individual whose output is being submitted to the REF was at a different UK HEI which failed to comply with the criteria.
  – The repository experienced a short-term or transient technical failure that prevented compliance with the criteria.
  – An external service provider failure prevented compliance (for instance, a subject repository did not enable open access at the end of the embargo period, or a subject repository ceased to operate).
Researchers moving between higher education institutions

• When a researcher moves between two HEIs, it will be acceptable for their deposited outputs to transit to the new institution’s repository, as long as there is no interruption to discovery or access during the transition.

• We will not require the submitting institution to seek and retain evidence of the previous HEI’s compliance with the deposit requirements.
Compliance

• Detailed verification and audit process to be established as part of the implementation of the post-2014 REF.
• Audit will require institutions to provide assurance about their processes and systems for recording open-access information, as well as taking a light-touch approach to verifying supporting information.
• Some parts of the audit, including of the deposit requirements, are expected to take place at the repository level, not the output level.
• We will be working with Jisc on establishing a metadata profile that institutions will be advised to adopt; as a minimum this is likely to include a record of the dates of acceptance, initial deposit, and the start and end dates of any embargo period.
• **Any output submitted to the post-2014 REF that falls within the scope of this policy but does not meet its requirements or exceptions will be treated as non-compliant. Non-compliant outputs will be given an unclassified score and will not be assessed in the REF.**
• We are working with Jisc on developing an approach to auditing embargo periods at the output level using data from external sources. However, we would advise that, in the first instance, evidence should be retained of any occasions where the agreed embargo period differs from that typically offered by the publication.
We need to ensure authors get to grips with self-deposit. Although mediated deposit will still be available, it will be simpler for the vast majority to be done by authors who are able to input the metadata (especially about dates) at the point of acceptance.

Authors must get to grips with self-depositing their last peer-reviewed drafts, upon acceptance by any journal which allows this.
By the way – costs for Gold so far

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal</th>
<th>Date posted</th>
<th>Amount spent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Library of Science</td>
<td>Apr-13</td>
<td>902.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PNAS National Academy of Sciences</td>
<td>May-13</td>
<td>2,534.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMJ Publishing</td>
<td>Jul-13</td>
<td>1,620.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Library of Science</td>
<td>Aug-13</td>
<td>907.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Library of Science (VAT)</td>
<td>Nov-13</td>
<td>181.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature</td>
<td>Nov-13</td>
<td>3,780.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsevier: Biochim. Biophys. Act</td>
<td>Nov-13</td>
<td>2,414.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cell Press: Current Biology</td>
<td>Dec-13</td>
<td>3,272.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Families, Relationships and Societies</td>
<td>Jan-14</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography Compass (Wiley)</td>
<td>Jan-14</td>
<td>2,252.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMC Structural Biology (via Nick Keene)</td>
<td>Feb-14</td>
<td>1,290.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Library of Science (VAT)</td>
<td>Feb-14</td>
<td>180.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PNAS National Academy of Sciences</td>
<td>Feb-14</td>
<td>506.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Library of Science</td>
<td>Mar-14</td>
<td>849.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroscience &amp; Behavioral Reviews</td>
<td>Apr-14</td>
<td>2,265.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Library of Science (VAT)</td>
<td>Jun-14</td>
<td>169.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental Psychology</td>
<td>Jun-14</td>
<td>2,448.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Science (Cost share with Bradford)</td>
<td>Jun-14</td>
<td>1,072.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Library of Science</td>
<td>Jun-14</td>
<td>414.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cerebral Cortex</td>
<td>Jun-14</td>
<td>4,022.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemical Geology</td>
<td>Jul-14</td>
<td>1,101.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental Review</td>
<td>Jul-14</td>
<td>1,100.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geology</td>
<td>Jul-14</td>
<td>1,461.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental Psychology</td>
<td>Jul-14</td>
<td>2,499.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cell Press: Current Biology (VAT)</td>
<td>Jul-14</td>
<td>654.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental Psychology (VAT)</td>
<td>Jul-14</td>
<td>489.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Library of Science (VAT)</td>
<td>Jul-14</td>
<td>82.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental Review (VAT)</td>
<td>Jul-14</td>
<td>220.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geology (VAT)</td>
<td>Jul-14</td>
<td>292.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental Psychology (VAT)</td>
<td>Jul-14</td>
<td>499.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Autism and Development</td>
<td>Aug-14</td>
<td>2,159.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acta Cryst F</td>
<td>Sep-14</td>
<td>718.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acta Cryst F</td>
<td>Sep-14</td>
<td>55.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wiley: The Journal of Child Psychology</td>
<td>Sep-14</td>
<td>2,285.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuberculosis</td>
<td>Sep-14</td>
<td>1,781.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schizophrenia Bulletin</td>
<td>Sep-14</td>
<td>2,550.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroscience and Behavioural Review</td>
<td>Oct-14?</td>
<td>2,250.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Open Access Agenda and Research Data

- REF2020 does not require OA to data, but...
- Research Councils are keen to promote OA to data
- RCUK have developed 7 common principles concerning data
- The principles are cached out in different ways by different Research Councils
RCUK Common Principles on Data Policy

1. Publicly funded research data should be made openly available with as few restrictions as possible.

2. Data with acknowledged long-term value should be preserved and remain accessible and usable for future research.

3. To enable research data to be discoverable and effectively re-used by others, sufficient metadata should be recorded and made openly available.

4. RCUK recognises that there are legal, ethical and commercial constraints on release of research data, which institutional policies should consider.

5. Those who undertake Research Council funded work may be entitled to a limited period of privileged use of the data they have collected.

6. All users of research data should acknowledge the sources of their data and abide by the terms and conditions under which they are accessed.

7. Public funds may support the management and sharing of publicly-funded research data.
Institutional Requirements to Support RCUK Principles

1. An institutional policy on Data Management and Sharing (DMS)
2. Integrating DMS awareness into research student training
3. Archiving of data collected under RCUK grants
4. A system akin to BIROn to describe data collected with RCUK funding (and point users to relevant archives)
5. Costing of long-term data archiving and curation into grants