Central administration of open access article fees on behalf of UK higher education

Findings from a scoping study undertaken by Content Complete Ltd for JISC Collections

Paul Harwood
JISC Collections

ASA Conference 2010
Tell you a bit about the background and context to the work

Report on the findings of the survey itself

Summarise some of the qualitative responses

Consider whether there is a role for an agency of some kind to help manage the process
Background and context to the Study

Undertaken between July and October 2009 by Content Complete on behalf of JISC Collections

Designed to establish:

- the extent of Gold OA activity in UK HEIs
- The different administrative approaches being taken by HEIs
- The extent of interest in a centralised administration service offered by a third party
- The extent of interest in the creation of a central registry which recorded all Gold OA articles funded on behalf of UK HE
Greater transparency of the extent of Gold OA publishing in UK HE might help negotiations on the level of OA article fees (for NESLi2 negotiations for example)

Although the NESLi2 Contract with publishers does make provision for this, it has proved hard to enforce.

Librarians are becoming increasingly resentful of potential ‘double dipping’ by publishers in terms of taking subscription and OA article fee income
Previous work in this area

- In 2008, Fred Friend, JISC’s Scholarly Communications Consultant, in collaboration with RIN/UUK undertook some work into how publishers were charging to publish OA articles.

- In March 2009, RIN published their report: ‘Paying for Open Access Publication Charges’: a practical guide for all parties (see: http://www.rin.ac.uk/openaccess-payment-fees)

- Stephen Pinfield, via the Library Directors’ list, lis-sconul, undertook a survey of institutions in June 2009.

- Christine Middleton’s paper at last November’s UKSG seminar (see: http://www.uksg.org/sites/uksg.org/files/PresentationMiddleton.pdf)
Response to the survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JISC Band</th>
<th>% of total responses</th>
<th>As a % of HE institutions in that band</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>54.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A total of 37 institutions responded
What did we learn about the scale of this activity?

- It is small.....
- A JISC Band ‘A’ institution reported that three months’ Wellcome-funded submissions amounted to 16 articles
- If, hypothetically, we doubled this to take account of non-Wellcome funded articles, the figure would be 128 per annum for this institution
- Multiplied by the number of UK HEIs currently in receipt of Wellcome funding, then the annual total falls just short of 4,000 articles
- This is compared with estimates of 2.5-3m articles published annually worldwide, with UK higher education being a significant contributor
Has your institution made available a central fund for academic staff and researchers to pay article fees for publication in fully OA or hybrid OA journals?

- Yes: 16%
- No: 84%
Is there a central administration system in place at your institution to support authors in making payment of the OA article fees to publishers?

- Yes: 35%
- No: 65%
If you answered 'yes' to Question 2, is this handled by the library or another department?

- **Library**: 75%
- **Another Department**: 25%
If no to Question 2, is this handled by authors themselves?

- Yes: 83%
- No: 17%
Do academic staff and researchers have to follow a set procedure within your institution when intending to publish in an OA journal?

- Yes: 22%
- No: 78%
Wellcome Trust open access publication: guidelines for researchers

What are the Wellcome Trust open access publication requirements?

The Wellcome Trust (WT) now requires its grant holders to deposit an "electronic copy of any research papers that have been accepted for publication in a peer-reviewed journal, and that are supported in whole or in part by Wellcome Trust funding, into PubMed Central (PMC) or UK PubMed Central (UKPMC), as soon as possible and in any event within six months of the journal publisher’s official date of publication".

The WT open access position statement gives further details and is supported by a WT author's guide and FAQ.

- [Wellcome Trust open access position statement](#)
Library Services

Schools and Departments » Library Services » Research and teaching support » Open access publishing

Wellcome Trust Grants

Wellcome Trust Research Grants are awarded under standard grant conditions. From 1st October 2006, the Wellcome Trust requires all Trust funded researchers to make their peer reviewed research papers available through UK Pub Med central as soon as possible and in any event no later than 6 months after publication.

How researchers comply with this condition depends on the individual journal or publisher in which they wish to publish.

- Which papers does the OA policy refer to?

  Research papers that have been accepted for publication in a peer reviewed journal or have been self published by the NIHR, and are supported in whole or in part by Wellcome funding

- Where should these papers be placed?
Are payments made directly to publishers by the central administration department or passed to authors for payment to publishers?
Are any publishers increasing their basic article fee with additional charges (eg for size of article, inclusion of illustrations etc)?

- Yes 45%
- No 55%
Does your institution undertake negotiations with any publishers to seek discounted levels of articles fees?

- Yes: 8%
- No: 92%
Do you have any Open Access institutional memberships with any publishers?

- Yes: 24%
- No: 76%
What do we mean by central administration?

- Not precisely spelt out to survey respondents, but taken to mean:
  - A third party managed helpdesk and administrative resource for processing OA article documentation and payments
  - Liaising directly with publishers and academics/departments or via the library
  - Not unlike the role of a subscription agent or the helpdesk service already provided by JISC Collections to UK HEIs
What did our library respondents see as the potential advantages?

- Simplifying and streamlining administration, currently handled in different ways by institutions
- Making it easier to share best practice
- Particularly helpful for smaller institutions with no centrally administered service
- Helping to understand at a national level, what has been published on an OA basis
- Potential for lower OA article fees
What did our library respondents see as potential problems?

- Promotion and enforcement of new procedures
- Integration with financial systems and practices
- ‘One size fits all’ system very difficult to achieve
- Article cost sharing between institutions or with Research Councils
In terms of taking such an initiative forward, senior librarians were split

- Concentrate on other issues, especially robust agreements with publishers regarding article fees, period of embargoes, deposit in multiple repositories
- Level of activity is simply too low at this time to make any central service worthwhile
- Institutions gearing-up to meet the requirements of the REF via their Mandating Policies

However:
- One senior librarian argued that the administrative burden on his LIS staff was considerable even though the number of transactions was low
- Another put forward a vision of an OA version of NESLi2 based on national negotiations of OA article fees and central payments to publishers
The views of other stakeholders: Wellcome Trust

- Wellcome has made awards to 31 UK institutions to meet the cost of OA article charges arising from Trust-funded research.

- Level of compliance with Wellcome policy is around 40% and there is a belief that administrative barriers at institution-level could partially be responsible for this.

- Wellcome hosted a meeting in September 2009 with institutions to discuss barriers and how they can be removed.

- Wellcome’s preference is for publishers to collect fees from institutions rather than direct from Wellcome, so that authors can see the different levels of fee charged and a marketplace can develop.

A Research Outputs Group has been convened to follow-up on the recommendations from the report

Pressing issues for priority action are currently:

- Consistency of mandating policies across the Councils
- Impact of budgets if they moved wholly or partially to OA
- How they can track what has been published
- How a switch to OA might change the funding flows between Research Councils and Universities
The views of other stakeholders: publishers

- 11 publishers were interviewed as part of the study, whose business models included wholly OA and hybrid OA.

- Most publishers confirmed the small scale of activity: less than 1% of total articles they publish. Because of this, procedures for administration are ad hoc. However, wholly OA publishers have developed robust online procedures for documentation and payments.

- Publishers reported that in most cases, OA payments are received directly from authors.

- One publisher reported that authors pay directly online via the CCC Rightslink service.

- Another publisher stated that 42% of payments were made by credit card, 32% by bank transfer and 26% by cheques.

- Publishers were mixed in their attitude towards a centralised service in terms of benefits to them. The most attractive element was centralised payment.

- One, in particular, felt that this was prime territory for subscription agents to get involved in.
Can we draw any meaningful conclusions from this study?

- The scale of Gold OA publishing in UK HE is still very small and some senior librarians believe that this militates against any centralised administration at this stage.

- Some of the reasons given by librarians for wanting a centralised service go beyond administrative issues and include, visibility of what has been published and the hope that OA article fees might be reduced as a result.

- Publishers’ preference is to see centralisation of payments and, ideally, fees paid directly by Wellcome.

- Wellcome is keen to see administrative improvements to the process but not at the expense of establishing a marketplace for authors.

- The Research Councils, a key player in this debate, seem a long way behind.
Third time lucky for subscription agents?

- **November 1992:** CARL Systems, Inc. selects B.H. Blackwell as strategic partner for UnCover:
  
  “CARL Systems, Inc. and B.H. Blackwell have signed a letter of intent to jointly develop, expand, and market the UnCover current awareness and article delivery service”.

- **December 1996:** SwetsNet offers new service for electronic journals
  
  “Swets Subscription Service has announced the launch of SwetsNet, a new service for full-text electronic journals. SwetsNet offers libraries and scholars a single source for ordering and accessing a broad range of publishers' electronic titles.”

- **January 2015? EBSCO announces third national agreement for managing Open Access publication fees
  
  “EBSCO Information Services today announced that it has concluded an agreement with the Higher Education Funding Council for England for the management and administration of all OA article fee payments made to publishers on behalf of the UK higher education community. It is estimated that some 250,000 transactions per annum will be processed....”
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