

Sign of the times

Open Access

 **BioMed** Central
The Open Access Publisher

www.biomedcentral.com

Open Access

IR policy matters

Jennifer De Beer

jad@sun.ac.za

[Policy panel session]

[11 May 2005]

An aside:
What will you 'do
with your one wild
and precious life?'

Mary Oliver "The Summer Day",
New and selected poems, 1992, Beacon Press, Boston.

Policy > Technology

Stevan Harnad

Talk outline

- Preamble (OA Context)
- The Nitty-Gritty (Institutional buy-in)
 - The proposal / white paper
 - Policy Advisory Group
 - Content Policy
 - Submission and Access Policy

Preamble

Open Access defined*

- free or low-barrier diffusion of scholarly research (De Beer)
- finds expression through:
 1. publication in Open Access journals;
 2. making research available in an institutional or disciplinary (a.k.a. subject-based) archive;
 3. making research available via departmental or personal homepages;
 4. making the research output of postgraduates available.

note:

1 = research publication = journal reform school of OA

2 to 4 = research dissemination = self-archiving school of OA

* defined for developing countries

Harnad's definition of the gold and green roads to OA is notable here:

UNIFIED DUAL OPEN-ACCESS-PROVISION POLICY:

BOAI-2 ("gold"): Publish your article in a suitable open-access journal whenever one exists.

<http://www.doaj.org/>

BOAI-1 ("green"): Otherwise, publish your article in a suitable toll-access journal and also self-archive it.

<http://www.eprints.org/self-faq/>

<http://romeo.eprints.org/>

<http://archives.eprints.org/>

OA Initiatives abroad [1]

- Three types

- Type 1: International or trans-national initiatives

- (SPARC; PLoS; BOAI; OAI; Biomed Central) +
 - (Declarations by funding bodies: e.g. Wellcome Trust; Bethesda Statement; Berlin Declaration)

OA Initiatives abroad [2]

- Three types

- Type 2: National initiatives

- UK House of Commons Science and Technology Committee;
 - USA-National Institutes of Health;
 - European Science Foundation;
 - UK-SHERPA & FAIR nat'l network of IR repositories;
 - Netherlands – DARE;
 - Germany – Max Planck Institute (eDoc);
 - Scottish Declaration on OA;
 - Messina Declaration (Italy);
 - Australia (University Vice Chancellors of 8 o/t most prestigious univ.).

OA Initiatives abroad [3]

- Three types

Type 3: Institutional initiatives where institutions adopt self-archiving policies

- France
- Germany
- Australia
- Portugal
- United Kingdom
- CERN

At present (1 April) 395 OAI-compliant OA archives in universities and research institutes in 40 countries (Harnad)

OA in South Africa

- Policy
- OA journals
- OA self-archiving (OAI compliant archives)

OA in South Africa [policy]

- Policy endorsements, mostly at level of access to data, and merely hint at need for Open Access
- Implementations of IRs / ETDs / OA journals have been disparate and uncoordinated
- Thus far no emphatic high-level endorsement of OA in SA

OA in South Africa [journals]

- As per the Directory of OA Journals (www.doaj.org)
- 20 'African' journals (of African origin and/or deal with African themes)
- 4 of the 20 are South African
- 2 of the 4 are SAPSE-accredited
 - South African Journal of Information Management
 - South African Journal of Animal Science

OA in South Africa [self-archiving]

- To date 4 OA (and OAI compliant) repositories in SA
 - RAU ETD repository*
 - UCT CS Dept Research document repository
 - UP ETD repository
 - arXiv mirror at Wits
- Non-OAI compliant (closed access) ETD repositories
 - University of Johannesburg*
 - Univ. of the Free State
 - UNISA
 - Rhodes Univ.

* Note discrepancy in open/closed statuses between the former RAU ETD repository and the now University of Johannesburg archive

Policy recommendation

- An enabling environment (OA ethos expressed via other policy endorsements)
- Statutory reporting on research output for SAPSE funding
- Mandate reporting on OA (OAI compliant) venues for research output for published research

The Nitty-Gritty

Institutional initiatives

- 1st prize (hi fi option): HE /research institution publicly declares support for OA by endorsing an existing declaration, such as the Berlin declaration
- 1st prize (lo fi option): set up institutional repository with institution- or faculty-wide support / endorsement

Doesn't have to be an either/or scenario – aim for both

How to get institutional buy-in (wooing and wowing the powers that be)

- You're here, that's a start!
- Write a proposal / white paper
- Circulate document through formal and informal university channels
- Some examples...

Remember: the declarations mentioned earlier can be used as starting points for the wording of your own institutional proposal/policy

Sample Layout 1*

- Introduction
- Definitions (of terms)
- History / Background
- Current Projects elsewhere
- IRs and Open Access (discerning between the two)
- Content
- Intellectual Property
- Administration
- Technology and Infrastructure
- Costs
- Promise and potential
- Concerns
- Summary

*Adapted from McLendon, W. 2005. Institutional repositories: a white paper for the UNC-Chapel Hill Scholarly Communications Convocation
<http://www.unc.edu/scholcomdig/whitepapers/mclendon.html>

Sample Layout 2*

- Executive summary
- Introduction
- Preparing for an IR
 - Technical aspects
 - Non-technical aspects
- Building a prototype IR
- Existing models and where (our institution) is today
- IR prototype participants
- Next steps
- Conclusion
- References & Appendixes

Ottaviani, J and Snavely, C. 2003. Towards a University of Michigan Institutional Repository: a study and prototype proposal
<http://www.umdl.umich.edu/pubs/inst-repos20031112.html>

[JAD: This is a very comprehensive example, especially w.r.t. the appendices.
See full-text for more.]

Sample Layout 3*

- Scope of the Archive
- Purpose of the Archive
- Print Fidelity of Bibliographic Metadata
- Institutional Subgroup Reorganisations
- Identifying Authors and Depositors Reliably
- EPrints Handbook <http://software.eprints.org/handbook/policy.php> ;
See also <http://www.ecs.soton.ac.uk/~lac/archpol.html>
- [JAD: Minimalist policy document and as such not ideal for purposes of advocacy, yet points raised need to be considered.]

Sample layout 4*

- Use Sample 2 but limit to one paragraph per topic, which results in a two-page proposal
- Prime example here:
Troll Covey, D. 2004. Does Carnegie Mellon need an institutional repository?
- http://www.andrew.cmu.edu/org/fac-senate/Focus_IRfinal.html

You've got buy-in.
Where next...

Define a policy (making/endorsing) group

- Decision-making w.r.t. IR services, standards, and functionality
- Group members
- Library Director
- IT Director
- Collection / Document management services
- Archives Director
- User Support Manager
- University Press representative
- Research Development Manager
- Institutional Planning Director

After Barton and Waters, 2004 <http://dspace.org/implement/leadirs.pdf>

Content policy

Submission and Access policy

Content policy [1]

- Defining collections
 - How will your collections be organised e.g. by Department, Subject, or Document Type?
 - What constitutes a collection?
 - Who determines and authorises submitters?
 - What are your contingency plans if a department ceases to exist?

[Hands-on exercise tomorrow]

Barton and Waters, 2004 <http://dspace.org/implement/leadirs.pdf>

Content policy [2]

- Content types to consider (bearing in mind also associated file formats)
 - Documents (articles (peer-reviewed and non peer-reviewed?), preprints, working papers, technical reports, conference papers)
 - Monographs (published and unpublished?)
 - Theses/Dissertations
 - Data sets
 - Computer programs
 - Visualisations, simulations, other models
 - Multimedia publications
 - Administrative records
 - Bibliographic datasets
 - Images
 - Audio files
 - Video files
 - Learning objects
 - Web pages

Content policy [3]

- Who can submit content?
- Must the work be education or research-oriented?
- Will the repository accept peer-reviewed content only?
- Does the work have to be born digital?
- Does the work have to be in finished form, ready for distribution?
- Does the author/owner have to grant the service the right to preserve and distribute the content?
- If the work is part of a series, must other works in that series be contributed as well?

Barton and Waters, 2004 <http://dspace.org/implement/leadirs.pdf>

Submission and access policy

- Is there an approval process for content being submitted?
- Are submitters notified of an item's progress in the submission process?
- Are there content size limits for individual items, individual faculty members, or collections?
- Will you have a user agreement with end-users of the system?
- Will you institute a privacy policy for those who register with the system?
- Will you allow limited access to certain items?

Barton and Waters, 2004 <http://dspace.org/implement/leadirs.pdf>

To be continued

- More hands-on exercises regarding the policy aspects on Thursday morning, but before I go...

The Directory of Open Access Repositories - DOAR

University of Nottingham, UK and University of Lund, Sweden are developing a new service for Open Access to research information.

A new service is starting development to support the rapidly emerging movement towards Open Access to research information. The new service, called **DOAR - the Directory of Open Access Repositories** - will categorise and list the wide variety of Open Access research archives that have grown up around the world. Such repositories have mushroomed over the last 2 years in response to calls by scholars and researchers worldwide to provide open access to research information.

DOAR will provide a comprehensive and authoritative list of institutional and subject-based repositories, as well as archives set up by funding agencies - like the National Institutes for Health in the USA or the Wellcome Trust in the UK and Europe. Users of the service will be able to analyse repositories by location, type, the material they hold and other measures. This will be of use both to users wishing to find original research papers and for third-party "service providers", like search engines or alert services, which need easy to use tools for developing tailored search services to suit specific user communities.

The project is a joint collaboration between the University of Nottingham in the UK and the University of Lund in Sweden. Both institutions are active in supporting Open Access development. Lund operates the [Directory of Open Access Journals \(DOAJ\)](#) which is known throughout the world