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Open Access for the researcher

- wide dissemination
  - papers more visible
  - cited more
- rapid dissemination
- ease of access
- cross-searchable
- value added services
  - hit counts on papers
  - personalised publications lists
  - citation analyses
Repository basis

△ institutional repositories combined with location-specific or subject-based search services

△ practical reasons
  – use institutional infrastructure
  – integration into work-flows and systems
  – support is close to academic users and contributors

△ OAI-PMH allows a single gateway to search and access many repositories
  – subject-based portals or views
  – subject-based classification and search
Eprint archiving

△ increased dissemination, access, impact
△ service to authors and researchers
△ use and content reflects discipline research methodology
△ cultural barriers to adoption
△ authors are willing to use repositories
△ deposition policies are key
Context

- Archiving activity
- Advocacy
- Policies
- Repositories
SHERPA -

△ Securing a Hybrid Environment for Research Preservation and Access

△ Partner institutions

  - Birkbeck College, Birmingham, Bristol, Cambridge, Durham, Edinburgh, Glasgow, Imperial College, Kings College, Leeds, LSE, Newcastle, Nottingham, Oxford, Royal Holloway, School of Oriental and African Studies, Sheffield, University College London, York; the British Library and AHDS

△ www.sherpa.ac.uk
SHERPA aims and outcomes

- Establish institutionally-based eprint repositories
- Advice - setting up, IPR, deposit, preservation
- Advocacy - awareness, promotion, change
Practical issues

- establishing an archive
- populating an archive
- copyright
- advocacy & changing working habits
- mounting material
- maintenance
- preservation
- concerns
Concerns

△ subject base more natural?
  – institutional infrastructure, view by subject

△ quality control?
  – peer-review clearly labelled

△ plagiarism
  – old problem - and easier to detect

△ “I have already got my material on my web-site . . . “
  – unstructured for RAE, access, search, preservation

△ threat to journals?
  – evidence shows co-existence possible - but in the future . . . ?

SHERPA
Select Committee Inquiry

House of Commons Science and Technology Committee:
- to examine expenditure, administration, and policy of OST
- to examine science and technology policy across government

Inquiry into scientific publications - 10 December 2003
Written evidence: 127 submissions (February 2004)
Oral evidence (March – May 2004)
- Commercial publishers, Society publishers, Open access publishers, Librarians, Authors, Government officials

Report published, 20 July 2004
Government response November 2004
Report - *Problems*

- Impact and Access barriers
- Price rises, Big Deal, VAT
- Competition
- Digital Preservation
- Disengagement of academics from process
Report - Solutions

- 82 recommendations in three main areas:
  - Improving the current system
  - ‘Author-pays’ publishing model
  - Institutional repositories
Improving the existing system

△ JISC to develop independent price monitoring
△ JISC to press for transparency on publishers’ costs
△ Office of Fair Trading to monitor market trends
△ Funding bodies to review library budgets
△ VAT problem to be addressed
△ JISC, NHS and HE purchasing consortia
△ JISC to improve licences negotiated with publishers
△ BL to be supported to provide digital preservation
Changing the system

△ Principle:

△ Publicly-funded research should be publicly available
IBERs - Recommendations

△ UK HEIs to set up IBERs
△ Research Councils mandate self archiving
△ Central body to oversee IBERs
△ IBER implementation government funded
  - identified as good value for money
△ IBERs should clearly label peer-reviewed content
△ RCs should investigate and if feasible mandate author-retention of copyright
National progress

△ All of 20 repositories in SHERPA are now live:
  – Birkbeck, Birmingham, Bristol, Cambridge, Durham, Edinburgh,
    Glasgow, Kings, Imperial, Leeds, LSE, Newcastle, Nottingham,
    Oxford, Royal Holloway, SOAS, Sheffield, UCL, York and the
    British Library

△ Other institutions are also live:
  – Bath, Cranfield, Open University, Portsmouth, Southampton, St
    Andrews

△ Other institutions are planning and installing IBERs

△ approx. 93% (of Nottingham’s) journals allow their
  authors to archive
1994 Group

△ University of Bath
△ University of Durham
△ University of East Anglia
△ University of Essex
△ University of Surrey
△ University of Exeter
△ Lancaster University
△ Birkbeck University of London
△ Goldsmiths
△ LSE
△ Royal Holloway
△ University of Reading
△ University of St Andrews
△ University of Sussex
△ University of Warwick
△ University of York
△ 50% operational repositories
△ . . . more on the way . . .
Russell Group

- University of Birmingham
- University of Bristol
- University of Cambridge
- Cardiff University
- University of Edinburgh
- University of Glasgow
- Imperial College
- King's College London
- University of Leeds
- University of Liverpool

- LSE
- University of Manchester
- University of Newcastle
- University of Nottingham
- University of Oxford
- University of Sheffield
- University of Southampton
- University of Warwick
- University College London

- 16 out of 19 operational
- . . . 100% on the way . . .
A selection of recent progress

- Scottish Declaration of Open Access
- 32 Italian Rectors and the Messina Declaration
- Austrian Rectors sign the Berlin Declaration
- Russian Libraries launch the St Petersburg Declaration
- Wellcome Trust’s repository
- Widespread publicity and support
- ...and India, Africa, Australia...
Futures

repositories can work in tandem with
- traditional journals
- OA journals
- overlay journals
- peer-review boards

possibilities to enhance research outputs
- multimedia outputs
- data sets
- developing papers