



UK-wide survey on the delivery of funders' open access policies

1. Introduction

UK-wide survey on the delivery of funders' open access policies: deadline for responses 1700 Friday 22 September 2017.

HEFCE, Jisc, the Wellcome Trust and Research Councils UK (RCUK) invite HEIs to participate in a UK-wide survey on the delivery of funders' open access policies. The survey gathers information on how far the sector is meeting the funders' open access policies and the tools which are being used to do so. The data collected will be shared with and used by the project funders (HEFCE, Jisc, the Wellcome Trust and RCUK) to inform policy implementation and systems development. Only one response per institution is permitted, and the deadline for completion is **Friday 22 September**. Although the survey is not mandatory, we would encourage all institutions to respond where possible.

How will the data be used?

The purpose of this survey is to further understand the level to which institutions are meeting policy requirements, and how they are going about doing so. We are not collecting information in this survey about the policies as they stand and the opportunities and challenges they create. HEFCE, Jisc, Wellcome and RCUK will analyse the responses and publish a report of the high level findings in winter 2017. Data will be reported on the aggregate and not institutional level, ensuring anonymity of individual responses.

How long will it take to complete?

We contracted Research Consulting to develop an appropriate, realistic survey using a quantitative assessment methodology. Based on the feedback we received, we expect that two person-days should be sufficient for most institutions to complete the template to a reasonable level of accuracy. We would like to re-iterate that we do not encourage institutions to spend longer than this to complete the survey. We have allowed approximately 5 weeks for institutions to complete to survey.

Further information

A [guidance document](#) has been developed to assist institutions with the completion of this survey.

Depending upon the level of interest we are looking into providing a webinar alongside some of the institutions who took part in the pilot survey, click [here](#) if you would like to take part in this.

Please forward any queries to researchpolicy@hefce.ac.uk.

2. Data Protection

HEFCE will share responses to this survey with the other funders of the project – RCUK, Jisc and Wellcome.

We ask for contact details so that HEFCE can contact your institution in the future regarding Open Access and for our administrative purposes. This information will be handled in accordance with the Data Protection Act (1998) and will not be shared with the other funders of this project or used for any other purposes. HEFCE is registered as a data controller with the [Information Commissioner's Office](#) (ICO). Our registration number is Z6366704 and you can check our [entry details](#) on the ICO's website.

Information provided in response to this survey may be made public, under the terms of the Freedom of Information Act or of an appropriate licence, or through another arrangement. Such information includes text, data and datasets. The Freedom of Information Act gives a public right of access to any information held by a public authority defined within the Act. This information will be held by a public authority, in this case HEFCE, and therefore the information provided in this survey may be subject to Freedom of Information (FOI) requests. FOIA applies to information provided by individuals and organisations, for example universities and colleges. This means that data and information are unlikely to be treated as confidential except in very particular circumstances. Further information about the Act is available at www.ico.org.uk. Please do not include personal information in your responses to the survey questions.

3. Institution and contact details

Before you start

A guidance document is available to download from the [HEFCE open access webpages](#). Please read it carefully, as it will help with your submission.

1. Please select the name of your institution:

If 'other', please specify (including UKPRN):

2. Please provide the institutional contact point for this return:

Please fill in:

Name	<input type="text"/>
Position/job title	<input type="text"/>
Email address	<input type="text"/>
Phone number	<input type="text"/>

4. Software

3. Which of the following software solutions are used in your institution?

	As a CRIS or equivalent	As an institutional repository	As both CRIS and institutional repository	Not used
Converis	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
DSpace	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
EPrints	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Hydra/Fedora	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Pure	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Symplectic	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Worktribe	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Other systems or in-house solutions (please specify):

4. What system(s)/software does your institution use to track APC transactions? (Tick all that apply.)

- CRIS
- In-house database (including e.g. spreadsheets)
- Institutional finance system
- Institutional repository
- Jisc Monitor Local
- Not applicable (e.g. volume of APC transactions is negligible)
- Other (please specify):

5. Tools and data sources

5. Which of the following approaches or tools do you use to identify publications within the scope of research funder open access policies on acceptance? (Tick all that apply.)

	Currently use	Plan to use in future	No plans to use
Notification of accepted manuscripts by authors to central administration or departmental staff	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Self-service recording/deposit of accepted manuscripts by authors in institutional systems	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Currently use	Plan to use in future	No plans to use
Jisc Publications Router	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Direct notification from publisher to institution	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Review of pre-print archives	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other (please provide details)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Please add any relevant comments and clarify why you selected "No plans to use" (if applicable):

6. Which of the following tools or data sources, if any, do you use to identify publications within the scope of research funder open access policies on publication? (Tick all that apply.) In your response, please indicate whether the data source is being queried directly by institutional staff ('via native interface') or is ingested by your institution's CRIS or repository.

	Via native interface	Via CRIS or repository
ArXiv	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Crossref	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
EuropePMC	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Jisc Publications Router	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Gateway to Research	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Google Scholar	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ORCID	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Researchfish	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Scopus	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Web of Science	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other (please specify below)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments:

6. Tools and data sources (continued)

7. Which of the following third party tools and data sources, if any, does your institution use to monitor whether publications are made available in accordance with funders' policies?

	We use this tool/data source regularly	We use this tool/data source occasionally	We are aware of this but don't use it	We were not previously aware of this
CORE (www.core.ac.uk)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
CrossREF	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Directory of Open Access Journals (DOAJ)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
EuropePMC	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Gateway to research	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Jisc Monitor Local	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Lantern (https://lantern.cottagelabs.com/)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
OADOI/Unpaywall	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
OpenAIRE	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Open Access Button	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Researchfish	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
SHERPA/REF	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
SHERPA/FACT	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
SHERPA/RoMeo	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Repository REF compliance checker (e.g. DSpace, EPrints)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other (please specify below)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments:

7. The Policy for open access in Research Excellence Framework 2021

In this page, you are asked to provide the number of publications from your institution that fell within the scope of the [REF 2021 OA Policy](#) in the period **1 April 2016** to **31 March 2017** ('the period of interest').

Please refer to the guidance document for further information on how to complete this section.

8. Please supply the total number of known research outputs that fell within the scope of the REF 2021 OA Policy in the period of interest and indicate how many of these you believe meet the deposit, discovery and access requirements (x). Note that research outputs are deemed to meet the access requirements during an embargo period, provided that the length of the embargo period is not greater than the maxima permitted by the policy. Please also state the number where an exception is known to apply (Y), and the

number which do not meet the requirements, and are not known to be covered by an exception (Z). Further information on exceptions is requested later in this survey.

	REF main panel A	REF main panel B	REF main panel C	REF main panel D	Total
Number of outputs which meet, or are expected to meet, the deposit, discovery and access requirements (X)					
Number of outputs where an exception is known to apply (Y)					
Number of outputs which have NOT met the deposit, discovery and access requirements, and are not known to be covered by an exception (Z)					
Total known in-scope outputs (X+Y+Z)					

9. Please estimate what proportion of outputs that fell within the scope of the REF 2021 OA Policy in the period of interest are currently known to the institution. For example, if you believe your authors publish 1,000 in-scope articles per year, but only 850 have been recorded in your systems to date, you would select 81-90%.

- Less than 50%
- 50-60%
- 61-70%
- 71-80%
- 81-90%
- 91-95%
- 96-100%
- We are unable to provide an estimate

10. Please provide any further information that is relevant to your responses above (maximum 200 words).

8. The Policy for open access in Research Excellence Framework 2021 (continued)

The questions on this page relate specifically to research outputs falling within the scope of the [REF 2021 OA Policy](#) in the period 1 April 2016 to 31 March 2017 ('the period of interest').

11. Which of the following best describes the institutional policy on the deposit of authors' outputs that was in place for the period of interest?

- Outputs should be deposited upon acceptance for publication
- Outputs should be deposited within 3 months of acceptance for publication
- Outputs should be deposited upon publication
- Outputs should be deposited within 3 months of publication
- Other (please specify):

12. To take account of the need for systems to be developed to support deposit-on-acceptance, during the first two years of the REF 2021 OA policy (1 April 2016 – 1 April 2018) outputs can be deposited up to three months after publication. Which of the following approaches would you like to see implemented in the REF 2021 OA policy from 1 April 2018? Please assume for the purposes of this question that any policy implemented from 1 April 2018 would apply for the remainder of the REF 2021 assessment period.

- Outputs should be deposited as soon after the point of acceptance as possible, and no later than three months after this date
- Outputs should be deposited no later than three months after the date of publication
- No institutional preference/prefer not to say

13. Please explain the reasons for your preferred approach from 1 April 2018 (200 words maximum).

9. The Policy for open access in Research Excellence Framework 2021 (continued)

14. What guidance does your institution give to authors on the use of subject repositories?

- All full text outputs must be deposited in the institutional repository, regardless of whether a copy is also held in a subject repository
- All metadata records must be held in the institutional repository/CRIS, but the full text can be deposited in ANY subject repository
- All metadata records must be held in the institutional repository/CRIS, but the full text can be deposited in A DEFINED LIST of subject repositories
- Outputs recorded in ANY subject repository do not need to be recorded in the institutional repository/CRIS
- Outputs deposited in A DEFINED LIST of subject repositories do not need to be recorded in the institutional repository/CRIS
- Left to authors' discretion
- Other (please specify):

15. Please state, or estimate, what percentage of your institution's outputs that fall within the scope of the REF 2021 OA policy in the period of interest were identified within the following time periods. Please ensure your answers add up to 100%.

- | | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------|
| Within 3 months of acceptance, identified pre-publication | <input type="text"/>
% |
| Within 3 months of acceptance, identified post-publication | <input type="text"/>
% |
| More than 3 months after acceptance, but within 3 months of publication | <input type="text"/>
% |
| More than 3 months post-publication | <input type="text"/>
% |
| Total: | <input type="text"/>
% |

Comments:

16. Please indicate whether you provided actual figures or estimates in your response to the previous question:

- Actual figures
- Estimates
- Combination of actual and estimated figures

17. To help us understand any challenges in meeting the requirements of the REF 2021 OA Policy for conference proceedings, please indicate the extent to which you agree with the statements below.

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Strongly agree
It is difficult to find and interpret publisher policies on self-archiving for conference proceedings.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
It is difficult to determine acceptance and/or publication dates for conference proceedings.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
It is difficult to determine whether conference proceedings are within the scope of the policy.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
It is difficult to determine whether conference papers are subsequently published.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
It is difficult to identify and obtain the author's accepted manuscript (AAM) for conference proceedings.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Please note any other issues encountered with conference proceedings (maximum 200 words):

10. Recording exceptions to the Policy for open access in REF 2021

The questions on this page relate specifically to research outputs falling within the scope of the [REF 2021 OA Policy](#).

Please refer to the guidance document for further information on how to complete this section.

18. Please indicate how you would typically determine and record the application of the following types of exceptions to the REF 2021 OA policy (tick all that apply):

	As an integral part of the article recording or deposit process	As part of a periodic review of potentially eligible outputs (e.g. annual or bi-annual exercise)	On final selection of the output for submission to a future REF	Other (please give details)
Deposit exceptions	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Access exceptions	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Technical exceptions	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other exceptions	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments:

19. What system/software does your institution use to record exceptions? (Tick all that apply.)

- CRIS or equivalent
- In-house database (including e.g. spreadsheets)
- Institutional repository
- None
- Other (please specify):

11. Recording exceptions to the Policy for open access in REF 2021 (continued)

If possible, please estimate how many in-scope outputs fell within the scope of each exception to the [REF 2021 OA Policy](#) in the period 1 April 2016 to 31 March 2017 ('the period of interest').

If you do not believe any outputs fell within a given exception's scope, please enter 0. If you are unable to estimate the number of outputs falling within the scope of each exception at the present time, please leave the relevant box(es) blank.

20. Number of deposit exceptions

- a. The individual whose output is being submitted to the REF was unable to secure the use of a repository at the point of acceptance.
- b. The individual whose output is being submitted to the REF experienced a delay in securing the final peer-reviewed text (for instance, where a paper has multiple authors).
- c. The individual whose output is being submitted to the REF was not employed by a UK HEI at the time of submission for publication.
- d. It would be unlawful to deposit, or request the deposit of, the output.
- e. Depositing the output would present a security risk.
- f. The output was published as 'gold' open access (for example, RCUK-funded projects where an open access article processing charge has been paid).
- Total:**

21. Number of access exceptions

- a. The output depends on the reproduction of third party content for which open access rights could not be granted (either within the specified timescales, or at all).
- b. The publication concerned requires an embargo period that exceeds the stated maxima, and was the most appropriate publication for the output.
- c. The publication concerned actively disallows open access deposit in a repository, and was the most appropriate publication for the output.
- Total:**

22. Number of technical exceptions

- a. At the point of acceptance, the individual whose output is being submitted to the REF was at a different UK HEI which failed to comply with the criteria.
- b. The repository experienced a short-term or transient technical failure that prevented compliance with the criteria (this should not apply to systemic issues).
- c. An external service provider failure prevented compliance (for instance, a subject repository did not enable open access at the end of the embargo period, or a subject repository ceased to operate).

Total:

23. Other exceptions – estimated number of outputs

24. Where you have identified articles falling within the scope of the 'other' exception, please provide details of the circumstances in question (200 words maximum).

25. Please provide any observations you can on the distribution of REF exceptions by main panel, noting any areas where this differs from the overall distribution of in-scope outputs for your institution (200 words maximum).

12. The RCUK and COAF open access policies

In the following section, you are asked to provide the number of publications from your institution that fell within the scope of the open access policies of:

[Research Councils UK \(RCUK\)](#)

[The Charities Open Access Fund \(COAF\)](#)

In each case, please give publication numbers for the period **1 April 2016 to 31 March 2017** ('the period of interest'), including those that are gold OA, green OA only, and not available in OA form. Where your institution produced no publications that fell within the scope of the policies, please enter '0' in the relevant boxes.

Please refer to the guidance document for further information on how to complete this section.

26. Please provide the following:

	RCUK only	COAF only	Both RCUK and COAF
Number of gold compliant publications (X)	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Number of green compliant publications (Y)	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Number of outputs not compliant with funders' requirements (Z)	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Total number of in-scope outputs (X+Y+Z)	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

27. Please indicate whether you provided actual figures or estimates in your response to the previous question:

	Actual figures	Estimated figures	Combination of actual and estimated figures	Not applicable
In scope outputs for RCUK only	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
In scope outputs for COAF only	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
In scope outputs for both RCUK and COAF	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

28. We are interested to understand what proportion of the sector's total gold open access outputs are currently supported by RCUK and COAF. Therefore, please estimate the number of APCs paid by your institution in the period of interest from sources OTHER THAN RCUK or COAF funding.

29. Please provide any further information that is relevant to your responses above, including details of how the figures were determined where you have provided estimates rather than actuals (200 words maximum).

13. Publication metadata

30. Have you implemented the RIOXX Metadata Application Profile in your repository/Open Archives Initiative Protocol for Metadata Harvesting (OAI-PMH) interface?

- Yes - Full RCUK RIOXX
- Yes - Basic RIOXX
- No
- Don't know

Comments:

14. Publication metadata (continued)

31. Please indicate why your institution has not implemented the RIOXX Metadata Application Profile? (Tick all that apply.)

- Incompatibility with institutional systems
- Lack of external support/guidance
- Lack of time/resource
- Lack of in-house expertise
- Benefits of implementation are unclear
- Other (please specify):

15. Publication metadata (continued)

32. Is information on funding sources for articles captured in your institutional repository?

- Yes - mandatory field (institutional policy or system-enforced)
- Yes - optional field
- No - but we are working towards capturing this information
- No - we have no plans to capture this information
- Other (please specify):

Comments:

33. Is funder metadata exposed in your OAI-PMH interface?

	Yes - via the RIOXX application profile	Yes - via another mechanism (please explain below)	No	Don't know
Funder name	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Funder ID	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Project ID/grant reference	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments:

34. Which of the following best describes the approach taken to licence-selection for content in your institutional repository?

- Author selects licence, with no further review
- Author selects licence, but it is subject to review by library staff
- Member of library staff selects licence
- No licence is specified
- Other (please specify):

35. Please state, or estimate, what PERCENTAGE of articles and conference proceedings deposited in your repository during the period 1 April 2016 to 31 March 2017 were made available under each of the following licensing arrangements. Please ensure your answers add up to 100%.

CC BY	<input type="text"/>
	%
CC BY SA	<input type="text"/>
	%
CC BY NC	<input type="text"/>
	%
CC BY ND	<input type="text"/>
	%
CC BY NC SA	<input type="text"/>
	%
CC BY NC ND	<input type="text"/>
	%
No licence, in copyright	<input type="text"/>
	%

No licence, copyright unknown	<input type="text"/>	%
Restricted access	<input type="text"/>	%
Public domain, CC0	<input type="text"/>	%
Other (e.g. institutional licence)	<input type="text"/>	%
Total:	<input type="text"/>	%

Please leave any relevant comments to clarify the above response. Should you be unable to respond, please explain the reasons for this.

36. The policy for open access in Research Excellence Framework 2021 allows deposited manuscripts to be replaced or augmented with an updated peer-reviewed manuscript or the final published version of record at a later date (Policy paragraph 20). Where manuscripts in your repository are updated in this way, which of the following best describes the process followed?

- The original manuscript is replaced by the updated manuscript
- The original manuscript is augmented by the updated manuscript
- Not applicable/not sure
- Other (please specify):

16. Costs of open access – staffing

37. Please estimate how many full-time equivalent staff members (FTEs) were directly engaged in supporting and implementing open access at your institution on 1 April 2017, and allocate these between the salary bands provided. Please refer to the guidance document for further information on how to complete this section.

	FTEs supported from RCUK block grant	FTEs supported from institutional funds or other sources
Less than £20,000 per annum	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
£20,000-30,000 per annum	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
£30,001-40,000 per annum	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
£40,001-50,000 per annum	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

	FTEs supported from RCUK block grant	FTEs supported from institutional funds or other sources
Over £50,000 per annum	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Total	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

What funding sources are used to support the staff listed above (institutional or external funding sources)?

38. Please provide details of any additional resource implications of open access for your institution, beyond those captured in the above figures (500 words maximum).