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Study background

- Replicating a UK survey of higher educational institutions assessing the extent of the adoption of central funds for the payment of OA APCs.
- Originally done 2009. In 2011, the authors repeated the survey via the LISCONUL email discussion list for UK library directors.
- The same questions were used.
    - [http://www.ingentaconnect.com/content/alpsp/lp/2012/00000025/00000002/art00005](http://www.ingentaconnect.com/content/alpsp/lp/2012/00000025/00000002/art00005)
UK study findings

- Number who had an ‘institutionally co-ordinated approach to payment of a per-article OA fees (such as a central fund)’:  
  - 2009 - 14% of respondents (8 out of 55)  
  - 2011 - 13% of respondents (7 out of 52)

- No clear pattern of how the central funds were administered: three by the library, three by the research support office and one jointly.

- Many said although no general central fund, they did administer centrally funds allocated by the Wellcome Trust to the institution to pay APCs, and that there were established procedures for researchers to claim these funds.
Our study

• Email sent to all CAUL (39) and CONZUL (6) members on 15 August, a reminder was sent 3 September 2012.
• 28 responses from:
  ▫ 24 CAUL members – 62%
  ▫ 4 CONZUL members – 67%
Aggregated responses

All identifiers have been removed to protect the innocent. Except in some cases (but they said it was OK)
Who has a fund?

| Does your institution have a centrally coordinated approach to payment of per-article OA fees? | Yes = 2 (7%) | No = 26 (93%) |

Two institutions have centrally administered funds:
- one by the Office of Research under the authority of the PVC Research
- the other through the Library Resource Services collaborating with the Library Research Support Team.
UK & ANZ comparison (2012) - Centrally co-ordinated approach?

- UK: No
- Australia/NZ: No
How much do established funds cost?

- QUT Library supports about 40 publications a year at $75,000 pa. The library offers a safety net approach if research grant body funding or faculty funding is not available to pay APCs.

- The other fund is still young, only supporting three publications to date.
Is a fund on the cards?

| If you do not have an institutional fund are you likely to in the next 12 months? | Yes = 2 | No = 14 | Unknown = 4 | Possibly = 6 |

Comments from institutions that said ‘No’:

- “XXX decided a number of years ago that all support for publication would be devolved to the faculties, to decide on as they see fit”

- “It would take longer than this to establish the policy framework”

- “We have met with our Research Services Office to raise awareness of research funding rules that allow budgeting for gold open access costs”
What do we mean by ‘possibly’?

• Three institutions suggest that discussions about policies are underway
• One said the research capacity of the university is increasing and NHRMC mandate might help
• Another said it will happen only if the business case demonstrates it will contribute to better HERDC/ERA outcomes
• One just said: “Hopefully”
UK & ANZ comparison (2012) –
If no central approach, likely to in next 12 months
How else is your institution supporting open access?

- Of the 17 institutions that said they did not have membership to an OA provider (65%):
  - Four institutions pointed out they support open access through providing the institutional repository
  - One university is a big open access journal publisher
  - One said they are developing an institutional policy on open access
  - One said they were doing training and awareness programs
  - One library is including funds for a pilot in 2013 budget to build the business case for OA
BioMed membership?

• BioMed Central –
  ▫ Eight institutions are members of BioMed Central (28.5%)
    • In one case this was from a one-off Internal Research Infrastructure grant
  ▫ Three others used to be members (10.5%)
    • in two cases there were issues with not being able to set a limit, making budgeting difficult
  ▫ Another said they are considering BioMed Central and arXiv support
### Other memberships?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Platform</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>arXiv</td>
<td>Two institutions are supporters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLoS</td>
<td>Two institutions are supporters*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wiley Open Access</td>
<td>One institution is a member as the result of a one-off internal Research Infrastructure grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>One institution also mentioned Nature, eLife, Knowledge Unlatched OA monographs publication model</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: two others said their academics had published in PLoS, but this is not what the question was asking – in reality many Australian researchers are publishing in PLoS*
What are the barriers to establishing a central fund?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12 respondents</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>Cost &amp; administration of the process, including inability to budget &amp; problem of who will administer the funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 respondents</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>Policy change in OA is not part of the strategic agenda across the institution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 respondents</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>Little interest in it at author level (including opposition to paying to publish)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 respondents</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>Potential that OA publication pulls focus from high impact journals &amp; therefore impacts on ERA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 respondents</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>Staff who understand the issues, can facilitate a coordinated approach and can communicate changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 respondent</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>This has been specifically devolved to the faculties</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Not all institutions responded
What is happening at the faculty level?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specific knowledge (some monitoring)</th>
<th>7 respondents</th>
<th>25%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Some knowledge</td>
<td>6 respondents</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No specific knowledge</td>
<td>15 respondents</td>
<td>53.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Of those with no specific knowledge, three respondents indicated there will be a discussion/study soon about the issue.
Payment for open access at faculty level?

- Anon 1: Jan-July 2012 – 17 papers from one faculty
- Victoria Uni: 9 papers in 2011 and 4 in 2012 in BioMed Central
- Lincoln Uni: Anecdotally about 10 articles in 2011
- ANU: Publish an average of 20 papers in BioMed Central each year & have published at least 74 papers in PLoS publications over several years
- Newcastle Uni: Increasing trend-
  - 2007-14 papers
  - 2008-38 papers
  - 2009-47 papers
  - 2010-52 papers
Conclusions

It is hard to come to a broad conclusion here
Observations

- The study was limited by the need to repeat the UK study as a comparator
- Australian universities are supporting open access in many ways
- Centralised funds are a long way from normal practice
- There seems to be a desire for more information and knowledge about this area (both within the institution and across the sector)
It is not too late!

- If you are from an institution who did not reply* and you want to before these results are written up and published, please send us an email:
  - danny.kingsley@anu.edu.au
  - vicki.picasso@newcastle.edu.au

- * We have the list if you are not sure! Just ask.