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Who are these people?

- Welcome to our international guests!
  - One quarter of the group, including people from Africa, Singapore, New Zealand and the UK
- Mostly library people (many responsible for repositories)
- Some participants are from government, some are publishers and some people from advocacy groups
Today

• Start with the big picture
  – Theoretical concepts about disseminating ideas
  – Where are we at in terms of OA worldwide?
  – Practical research into populating repositories

• What are the messages?
  – Incentives – who benefits from open access?
  – Integration – into existing systems
  – Regulations – to mandate or not to mandate
  – Barriers to repository use

• The process of advocacy
  – Contact points in the research cycle
  – Sales pitches
  – Advocacy by stealth
We need to get moving every 20 minutes

THEORETICAL CONCEPTS ABOUT DISSEMINATING IDEAS
Diffusion of Innovations

1st edition 1962
5th edition 2003
What?

• Innovation
  – “an idea practice or object that is perceived as new by an individual”

• Diffusion process
  – “concerned with communication of a new idea to members of a social system”
What is the ‘innovation’?

• Repositories ....
• AND (sometimes) open access itself
• Remember the 1999 referendum?
  – Asked whether Australia should become a republic with a President appointed by Parliament
    • following a bi-partisan appointment model approved by a half elected, half appointed Constitutional Convention held in Canberra Feb 1998
1999 referendum

There was a picture of a button saying ‘vote NO to the politician’s republic’ here

There was a picture of the outcome of the referendum here - http://www.statusquo.org/aru_html/images/Referendum/republic.gif
Build repositories and they will come?

• Thanks to David Groenwegen
Successful innovations have

- **Advantage** over current system(s)
- **Compatibility** with existing processes
- **Trialability** the degree to which an innovation may be experimented with on a limited basis
- **Observability** the degree to which the results of an innovation are visible to others
- **Less perceived complexity**
Where are we at?

Categories of Innovativeness*

- Early Adopters 13.5%
- Early Majority 34%
- Late Majority 34%
- Laggards 16%

Get up!

• Find three people to talk to
  – Ideally one international person per group
  – Ideally people you have never met before
• Work out, given your audience, what your repositor(ies) offer in terms of:
  – Advantage
  – Compatibility
  – Trialability
  – Observability
  – Perceived complexity
• Have the conversation on your feet
HOW MUCH RESEARCH IS OA?
More work is available green OA than gold OA

• Study* of the proportion of research published in 2008 that was available OA in 2009:
  • One in 5 papers - split between OA journals & repositories.
    – OA journals - 8.5% of all published papers (one in four of these in a hybrid journal)
    – Repositories 11.9% of all published papers

• Note: Follow-up study showed that five years on 42-48% of research published in 2008 was OA
Academia is not homogenous

- The way they PUBLISH
- The SPEED of the work is very different
- Academics have little idea of how other disciplines work
- The type of opposition will change from discipline to discipline
Spectrum of scholarly communication

- Hard science
- ‘Urban’

- Arts & humanities
- ‘Rural’
Disciplinary trends

![Disciplinary trends chart]

**Figure 3.** Average percent OA for the 2009 sample (for publication years 1998-2006) and 2011 sample (for publication years 2005-2010).

OA availability by discipline.

http://www.plosone.org/article/info:doi/10.1371/journal.pone.0011273
Consider...

- What are the disciplinary patterns in your institution?
- Have you noticed differences in the attitudes towards/interest in open access depending on the discipline?
- Then stand up!
Lots of people want the answer...
Sustainable practices for populating repositories

• Eight complementary practices
  – Advocacy
  – Institutional Mandates
  – Metrics
  – Recruitment and Deposit Services
  – Research Biographies
  – Institutional Profiles
  – Publisher agreements
  – Direct Deposit

From Confederation of Open Access Repositories (COAR) “Incentives, Integration and Mediation: Sustainable Practices for Populating Repositories” June 2013
Three categories

– Incentives
  • Promoting the benefits of repositories through advocacy and metrics as well as adoption of policies/mandates that require deposit

– Integration
  • Amalgamating repository services with other institutional services like research information systems and research biographies

– Mediation
  • Implementing tools, workflows and agreements that ease and simplify the deposit process
INCENTIVES

Advocacy, research biographies, institutional profiles
Who benefits from open access?

- Researchers in developing countries can see your work
- Taxpayers get value for money
- More exposure for your work
- Practitioners can apply your findings
- Higher citation rates
- Compliant with grant rules
- Your research can influence policy
- The public can access your findings

CC BY Danny Kingsley & Sarah Brown
More exposure for work

Researchers in developing countries can see your work

More exposure for your work

Practitioners can apply your findings

Higher citation rates

Compliant with grant rules

The public can access your findings

Your research can influence policy

Taxpayers get value for money
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Benefits – exposure
Average no of times an article is cited?

• H-index scores in 2011 and increases from 2009, School of Public Health, University of Sydney.


---

**KEY POINTS SUMMARY:** In 57 academic and research staff:

- Zero had H=0
- 15 (26.3%) had H between 2 – 9. These staff had an average of 10 research active years.
- 20 (35.1%) had H between 10-19. These staff had an average of 11.9 research active years.
- 11 (19.3%) had H between 20-39. These staff had an average of 16.6 research active years.
- 11 (19.3%) had H of 40 or over. These staff had an average of 28.7 research active years.
- 1 (1.8%) had H of over 60. This staff was research active for 24 years.

---

“an h index of 20 after 20 years of scientific activity characterizes a successful scientist”

“an h index of 40 after 20 years of scientific activity characterizes outstanding scientists likely to be found only at the top universities or major research laboratories”

“an h index of 60 .. after 20 years ...characterizes truly unique individuals”

Hirsch JE. An Index to quantify and individual’s scientific research output. PNAS 2005;102:16569-72
Article level metrics
Novel Biochemical Markers of Psychosocial Stress in Women

Total Article Views: 4,301

*Although we update our data on a daily basis, there may be a 48-hour delay before the most recent numbers are available. PMC data is posted on a monthly basis and will be made available once received.
PLOS ONE metrics view (2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Citations</th>
<th>scopus</th>
<th>crossref</th>
<th>PMC</th>
<th>PLoS Science</th>
<th>Google</th>
<th>Search</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Search</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Networks</th>
<th>citeulike</th>
<th>Mendeley</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Blogs and Media Coverage</th>
<th>Google</th>
<th>Search</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLoS Readers</th>
<th>Average Rating</th>
<th>(1 User Rating)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Australian Open Access Support Group
Practitioners can apply your findings

- Researchers in developing countries can see your work
- More exposure for your work
- Taxpayers get value for money
- Practitioners can apply your findings
- Higher citation rates
- Compliant with grant rules
- Your research can influence policy
- The public can access your findings

CC BY Danny Kingsley & Sarah Brown
There’s a whole world out there

- Start up technology companies
- General Practitioners
- Teachers
- Pharmacists
- Accountants
- Nurses
Higher citation rates

Researchers in developing countries can see your work

More exposure for your work

Practitioners can apply your findings

Taxpayers get value for money

Compliant with grant rules

Higher citation rates

The public can access your findings

Your research can influence policy

CC BY Danny Kingsley & Sarah Brown
Does OA increase citations?

- Generally there is a positive effect – many studies:
  - The effect of open access and downloads ('hits') on citation impact: a bibliography of studies”

- But lower quality material gets lost in the soup:
  - The Rich Get Richer and the Poor Get Poorer: The Effect of Open Access on Cites to Science Journals Across the Quality Spectrum – Mark McCabe & Christopher Snyder
    (23 May 2013)
Your research can influence policy

- More exposure for your work
- Researchers in developing countries can see your work
- Taxpayers get value for money
- Compliant with grant rules
- Practitioners can apply your findings
- Higher citation rates
- The public can access your findings
- Your research can influence policy

CC BY Danny Kingsley & Sarah Brown
2012 National Research Investment Plan

• “Science and research are also essential inputs to government policy development and program evaluation. Governments have an increasing need to systematically and effectively incorporate robust science and research evidence into the policy making process across the full range of government responsibilities”. (p 13)

More exposure for work

- Researchers in developing countries can see your work
- Taxpayers get value for money
- Compliant with grant rules
- The public can access your findings
- Practitioners can apply your findings
- Higher citation rates
- Your research can influence policy

CC BY Danny Kingsley & Sarah Brown
15-year-old develops pancreatic cancer test

Open Access Empowers 16-Year-Old to Make Cancer Breakthrough

SPARC's student initiative, the Right to Research Coalition, has released a video interview of Jack Andraka, a high school sophomore who won the 2012 Intel International Science and Engineering Fair with a breakthrough diagnostic for pancreatic cancer. Interviewed by Patrick Collins, the director of the National Institutes of Health (NIH), Andraka discusses how open access articles and NIH's Pubmed Central played a key role in enabling his discovery.

Andraka used free online articles "relentlessly" in creating his pancreatic diagnostic that is 766.67 times faster, and 103 times more sensitive than the current test. In discussing his discovery, Andraka points to paywalls of journal articles as a major barrier preventing others from making similar breakthroughs.

This story is just one example of the innovations that can happen when everyone has access to free scholarly articles.

http://www.arl.org/news/community-updates/2779
AOASG
Australian Open Access Support Group

Taxpayers get value for money

- Researchers in developing countries can see your work
- More exposure for your work
- Practitioners can apply your findings
- Higher citation rates
- Your research can influence policy
- The public can access your findings
- Compliant with grant rules
- Taxpayers get value for money

CC BY Danny Kingsley & Sarah Brown
Why open access?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commercial STM publisher</th>
<th>Profit in 2010 or early 2011</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elsevier</td>
<td>£724m on revenue of £2b</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springer’s Science+Business Media</td>
<td>£294m on revenue of £866m</td>
<td>33.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Wiley &amp; Sons</td>
<td>$106m on revenue of $253m</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic division of Informa plc</td>
<td>£47m on revenue of £145m</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Elsevier’s annual reports for the last nine years:

- 2002: £429m profit on £1295m revenue – 33.18%
- 2003: £467m profit on £1381m revenue – 33.82%
- 2004: £460m profit on £1363m revenue – 33.75%
- 2005: £449m profit on £1436m revenue – 31.25%
- 2006: £465m profit on £1521m revenue – 30.57%
- 2007: £477m profit on £1507m revenue – 31.65%
- 2008: £568m profit on £1700m revenue – 33.41%
- 2009: £693m profit on £1985m revenue – 34.91%
- 2010: £724m profit on £2026m revenue – 35.74%
- 2011: £768m profit on £2058M revenue – 37.3%

http://www.reedelsevier.com/investorcentre/reports%202007/Pages/Home.aspx
What does Elsevier’s profit of 35.74% mean?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What paying for</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Where money goes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Downloading a PDF from a journal</td>
<td>$37.95</td>
<td>$13.56 to shareholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hybrid open access payment</td>
<td>$3000</td>
<td>$1072.20 to shareholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library payment for bundle of Elsevier subscriptions</td>
<td>$1.7 million</td>
<td>$607,580 to shareholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any reason</td>
<td>$23783</td>
<td>Enough to sponsor US Representative to fund Research Works Act</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Researchers in developing countries can see work

- More exposure for your work
- Practitioners can apply your findings
- Higher citation rates
- Your research can influence policy
- The public can access your findings
- Compliant with grant rules
- Taxpayers get value for money

Researchers in developing countries can see your work
It is expensive!

Figure 1: Data from Association of Research Libraries showing relative growth of serials expenditure against the consumer price index

If Harvard can’t afford it....

There was a picture of the Guardian story “Harvard University says it can’t afford journal publisher’s prices” here -

http://www.theguardian.com/science/2012/apr/24/harvard-university-journal-publishers-prices
Incentives work! (carrot)

- The University of Minho, in the year after combining a financial incentive with the implementation of a mandate policy, experienced a 390% increase in repository use
  - During 2005, a financial supplement of 99,000 euros distributed to departments and research centres as a reward for their commitment in the implementation of the policy (not directly to individual researchers)
    - 42% of the reward = no of self-archived documents till April 2005
    - 33% = no archived between May and August 2005, &
    - 25% = no archived from September to December 2005.
    http://www.dlib.org/dlib/january08/ferreira/01ferreira.html
Incentives work! (stick)

• University of Liege, Nov 2008, the library launched its DSpace-based institutional repository ORBi, early 2009 policy said evaluations, appointments, promotions and budget allocations - decisions will take into account only references that are archived in ORBi
  – As at May 2013, ORBi contains more than 94,700 references, of which about 57,800 (61%) have a full text (29,900 of them [52]% with an OA full text), and gets more than 2,400 downloads a day (spiders excluded).
    – [http://initiatives.exlibrisgroup.com/2013/05/a-mandate-for-open-access-university-of.html](http://initiatives.exlibrisgroup.com/2013/05/a-mandate-for-open-access-university-of.html)
Find your new friends

- What are you doing?
  - Are you using incentives or sticks?
  - What are some things you *could* be doing?

- Brainstorm with your colleagues
  - Decide on two things you can do when you go back to work
Amalgamating repository services with other institutional services

INTEGRATION
Compliant with grant rules

- More exposure for your work
- Practitioners can apply your findings
- Higher citation rates
- Your research can influence policy
- The public can access your findings
- Taxpayers get value for money
- Researchers in developing countries can see your work

Compliant with grant rules

CC BY Danny Kingsley & Sarah Brown
ARC & NHMRC - OA policies

• ARC (introduced 1 January 2013)
  – All outputs (including books)
  – 2013 grants onward (we will not see OA output for several years)

• NHMRC (introduced 1 July 2012)
  – Journal articles only
  – Any publication after 1 July 2012 regardless of the grant
Requirements of ARC & NHMRC policies

What ARC & NHMRC policies mandate, prefer and permit

**STEP 1** Accepted: article/chapter/book
- Provide details: publication metadata etc.

**STEP 2** Published: article/chapter/book
- Provide copy: author's version OR
- Provide URL: link to OA article in journal OR
- Provide URL: link to OA item in discipline repository

Published materials
Materials suitable for Open Access include articles, chapters, notes and bosses

Policy links
- NHMRC mandate policy on the dissemination of research findings — www.nhmrc.gov.au/grants-policy dissemination research findings

AOASG
Australian Open Access Support Group

http://aoasg.org.au
ARC & NHMRC policy decision tree

Voluntary deposit in institutional repository

Deposited metadata in repository (mandated)

Repository makes work available, respecting embargoes

Researcher provides written explanation why no OA in Final Report

Repository holds record without making item OA

Repository points to OA version

Published in OA journal?

Funded research?

article/chapter/book accepted for publication

article/chapter/book published

http://aoasg.org.au
Social media & staff profile pages
QUT academics tweeting links to their OA pubs in QUT ePrints
April 12th tweet links to open access copy in QUT ePrints
You can see the impact of the tweet on downloads.
REGULATION

There was a picture of legal books here.
Selling the message internally
Managing up

Lancaster University structure - [http://www.lancaster.ac.uk/vc/images/seniorofficers2.gif](http://www.lancaster.ac.uk/vc/images/seniorofficers2.gif)
What are your policies?
Australia

- Now a quarter of unis have an OA mandate

http://aoasg.org.au/resources/
It has been a good OAWk!
Mandates alone are not enough

• They must be accompanied with
  – Guidelines
  – Promotion
    • The higher the person promoting the better
  – Advocacy
  – Support
    • Of the researchers by the repository
    • Of the repository by the institution
      – Staffing
      – IT support
Time to talk!

• What is the policy situation at your institution?
  – Have you been able to leverage this?
• Given your situation who is your target audience at the moment?
  – Is it the executive or the academics?
• What benefits do you think will resonate with
  – The institutional executive
  – The academic population
BARRIERS TO REPOSITORY USE

There was a picture of two burly security guards here.
Barriers to engagement with OA

• Lack of infrastructure
  – No subject-based repository (eg: arXiv, PubMed Central, RePEc, SSRN)
  – No institutional repository

• Infrastructure difficult to use
  – Copyright checking complex (even for me!)
  – Technical issues, eg: converting files to pdf
  – Administration of payment of article processing fees complex

• Lack of incentive
  – No mandate or other policy support for open access
  – No institutional/funding support for article processing fees

• Fear
  – Of plagiarism
  – Of contravening publisher’s agreements (& therefore risking further publication)
Overcoming barriers

• Resistance to taking on additional work due to time pressure
  – Provide mediation (doing it for them)
  – Simplify the deposit process
  – Integrate the repository into other systems
Overcoming barriers

• Confusion and antagonism about open access (researchers see themselves as the ‘meat in the sandwich’)
  – A serious underlying problem of a lack of understanding of the scholarly communication process.
  – Many academics (and librarians for that matter) do not have a good grounding

• Refocus
  – From: ‘information literacy’
  – To: ‘scholarly publishing literacy’
Consider...

• What processes are there for scholarly publishing literacy education at your institution?
• What are your own levels of knowledge in this area? Could you confidently answer questions on:
  – Academic reward system
  – Peer review system
  – Predatory publishers
  – Rejection rates of journals
  – Impact factors (and how they are calculated)
There was a picture that said “Keep Calm and Have a Cup of Tea” here.
“A man who is very busy seldom changes his opinions” – Friedrich Nietzsche

CONTACT POINTS IN THE RESEARCH CYCLE
Audience

• Who are these people?
  – Academic community
  – University administration (DVCs down)
  – Heads of School

• What are their circumstances?
  – Available time (to take on a new concept)
  – Their awareness
  – Their interest
Is this a bad time?

• Academics are very busy
  – Teaching (40%)
    • Not rewarded but takes up huge amounts of time
  – Researching & writing papers (40%)
    • The one thing that does count
  – Administration (20%)
    • Resentful about it

• Most people’s time breakdown adds up to more than 100%
  – Refereeing
    • Invisible work
  – Editing roles
    • Time consuming, not rewarded
  – Applying for grants
    • Wasted time (only 24% ARC grant applications successful)
Consider the academic timetable

• Avoid:
  – Just before term starts
  – Exam period
  – Summer holiday (for Computer Science & Engineering)
    • conference season &
    • grant application season
Lifecycle of scholarly information
Get in at the beginning - ethics & grants
Jump in early

• Get talking to your research management people
  – Send a congratulations email when ARC & NHMRC grants announced (with a reminder)

• Use the ethics process
  – Include in reminder email about research protocols “don’t forget to make your work avail”
Some disciplines share Submitted Versions

Formation
Measurement
Registration
Reuse
Evaluation
Preservation
Dissemination
Ideally capture accepted manuscript at time of acceptance
Do you dare go there?

- Measurement
- Registration
- Reuse
- Evaluation
- Preservation
- Dissemination
Repositories’ main role
Benefits of repositories

• Grey literature - theses, working papers etc
  – otherwise unfindable
  – Difficult to gauge use

• Theses are highly used in repositories
  – The authors are future researchers
  – They are very impressed when you tell them how many times their work has been accessed
Downloads and stats are very valuable
One last chat...

• Given the processes/people/structure within your institution...
  – Who do you need to talk to to get some of these things happening?
  – How difficult will it be to get ‘buy in’
  – What can you do to overcome that resistance?
SALES PITCHES

There was a picture of a cheesy salesman here
Leverage the stats

• Publish download figures in various ways:
  – Statistics Dashboard concept
  – Popular authors by downloads
  – Geographic Downloads
  – External vs Internal

• Contact authors & congratulating them on their downloads
  – cc Head of School or ADR where the download figure reaches a major milestone
  – send short news item to campus newspaper or news website.
Most downloaded from QUT ePrints
Google Analytics - Digital Collections
The Conversation
There was a picture of a man standing on a soap box talking to people in a park here.
Disseminating ideas

• How are institution-wide ideas communicated in your organisation?
  – Email
  – Social media
  – Flyers
  – News tickers on webpages
  – Public lectures
  – Staff meetings

• Which do you think are effective?
Target the message

There was a picture of Ronald McDonald here

There was a picture of McDonald's coffee menu here
Best channels

• Are group discussions successful?
  – Can be disciplinary focused
  – Go to them when they have their regular meeting
    (morning tea, formal monthly meeting etc)
  – Many concerns are common to others

• One on one is highly effective
  – People who ‘get’ it become enthusiasts
  – But entirely unscalable
ADVOCACY BY STEALTH

There was a picture of a cat stalking a bird here.
You know this stuff

- Link repository to staff profile system
- Integrating citation information
- Integrating usage statistics
- Implement compliance via the performance management system
- Linking green OA to open data
Request a copy

• Allows authors to share research directly with each other
• Publishers often give researchers a link to their pdf that they can send researchers (50x)
  – Updated version of ‘offprints’
• But there is no rule that prevents authors from sharing their accepted versions – it used to be by postcard
• You cannot automatically send the requestor a copy of the work – you need to put the requestor in contact with the research
  – A problem if they have left the institution!
Request copy button

The Semantic Web Revisited

PDF - Requires a PDF viewer such as GSview, Xpdf or Adobe Acrobat Reader
127Kb

Image (JPEG)
302Kb

Image (JPEG)
38Kb

Image (JPEG)
17Kb

Other (Microsoft Excel Spreadsheet - Supporting Data) - Registered users only
14Kb

Official URL: http://doi.ieeecomputersociety.org/10.1109/MIS.2006.62
No-one wants to go to an empty venue
Pre-populate
Where can you get deposits?

- Finding material (full-text) to put into repository – grey literature etc
- Auto ingest of records from service providers
You already have material

- Look at material in a reporting repository and upload items which can use the pdf

http://www.sherpa.ac.uk/romeo/PDFandIR.html
Make it the place to be

There was a picture of people partying here
Take home notes

• What your repository offers from a diffusion perspective
• The disciplinary patterns in your institution
• What incentives and promotions you are currently doing
• Your policy situation (and what you need to do about it!)
• Scholarly publishing literacy - how is yours? What about your academic community?
• Ways you can integrate making work available in the repository within your normal university operations
Questions?

Australian Open Access Support Group

w: [http://aoasg.org.au](http://aoasg.org.au)
e: [eo@aoasg.org.au](mailto:eo@aoasg.org.au)
p: 02 6125 6839
t: [@openaccess_oz](mailto:@openaccess_oz)