# University of Southampton

# RCUK Policy on Open Access: compliance monitoring

This report summarises the work at the University of Southampton in implementing the RCUK policy on open access during the period April 2013 to July 2014. Readers are requested to note the following comments which set the context for the information provided.

Philosophy of approach

The University of Southampton has a preference for green open access, but also supports gold open access and in particular high quality open access journals with appropriate business models that ensure value for money. We aim to continue to improve compliance whilst supporting the freedom of researchers to select the most appropriate established and emerging publications in their disciplines. Our emphasis in this first phase has been on promoting open access rather than identifying non-compliance.

Caveats on source data

The total number of RCUK funded publications for the University of Southampton is taken from journal articles and conference proceedings with any author affiliated to the University and mapped as funded by RCUK in Thomson Reuters Web of Science Core Collection, plus additional publications meeting the same criteria not indexed by Thomson Reuters but listed in the University of Southampton Institutional Repository.

Caveats on compliance with Licences

We have endeavoured to ensure that all our RCUK funded APCs have included a CC BY licence. This has involved manual checks and contacting publishers after payment to change licences to CC BY. It is hard to be certain the extent to which this is publisher error, or the complexity of licence choice presented to authors who select the wrong licence as part of the submission process.

We will attach a CC BY-NC licence or equivalent to green open access copies where we have evidence that we are able to do this, but the majority of publishers do not provide information about reuse licence options. For this element of compliance to work fully more discussions with publishers are needed to clarify rights. Authors should not need to negotiate this individually.

Looking forward

Academic staff, faculty administrators, and Professional Services staff have all learned a great deal over the initial period of implementation of the policy. The University has invested in systems and procedures to support the policy, which have evolved over the period as we have learned from our experience. We are pleased to report that we have achieved the compliance rate set as our target in the first year of the policy.

We are committed to further promoting open access both institutionally, working formally and informally with our research community, and nationally, for example by contributing to the End-to-End Open Access Process Review and Improvements OA Pathfinder project, and are in a strong position to do so during the current review period.
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Annex A Financial Data Collection

Section A – Expenditure by publisher

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|   | Amount | No of Articles |
| £ |
| American Chemical Society | 15,107.86 | 10 |
| American Physical Society | 1,015.13 | 1 |
| American Society for Biochemistry and Molecular Biology | 1,276.06 | 1 |
| BioMed Central Ltd | 6213.00 | 5 |
| BMJ Publishing Group | 7,325.99 | 3 |
| Cambridge University Press (Journals) | 4,068.00 | 2 |
| Copernicus GmBH | 1,063.08 | 1 |
| Elsevier | 51774.26 | 31 |
| Frontiers Media SA | 1,276.02 | 1 |
| IEEE | 1,040.45 | 1 |
| IOP Publishing Ltd | 660 | 1 |
| John Wiley & Sons | 27,260.73 | 14 |
| Journal of Medical Internet Research | 1,176.33 | 1 |
| Nature Publishing Group | 18,806.40 | 9 |
| Optical Society of America | 813.02 | 1 |
| Oxford Journals | 2,415.00 | 1 |
| Public Library of Science (PLoS) | 14,446.32 | 16 |
| Royal Society Of Chemistry | 24,336.00 | 15 |
| S.Karger AG | 1,693.90 | 1 |
| Springer-Verlag Gmbh | 9,416.57 | 5 |
| Taylor & Francis | 10,935.02 | 5 |
| The Company of Biologists | 2,400.00 | 1 |
| The Royal Society | 1,260.00 | 1 |
|   |  |   |
| **Total** | **£205,779.14** | **127** |

N.B. includes £19.932.03 for APCs funded outwith RCUK block grant

Section B – Other expenditure analysis

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Item | £ |
| Reverse charge VAT | 1,020.00 |
| Salaries | 24,960.14 |
| Subscriptions/memberships | 8,722.32 |
| **Total** | **34,702.46** |

*Reverse charge VAT* The figure for reverse charges represents as yet unallocated VAT charges. When an invoice from an international supplier does not include VAT, the institution is required to make a reverse charge if there is a VAT liability. The sums are only allocated to specific invoices by the Finance Office at quarterly intervals, and this sum represents the VAT liability for invoices paid since the last reconciliation. It will be allocated to specific publishers in due course.

*Salaries* The library has invested staff time in supporting the processes necessary to implement the RCUK policies. The cost represents 18% FTE of a library administrator, 20% FTE of an academic liaison librarian, both over the period covered by the report, and a small amount of overtime paid to a library assistant. The role of the liaison librarian has included advocacy and dissemination of the policy.

*Subscriptions/memberships* Several major publishers have offered subscription packages whereby an initial payment has led to lower APCs for papers submitted to the company’s journals. Where these have offered good value, we have subscribed, and this cost represents the cost of subscriptions. The publishers are

Biomed Central & Springer Open – membership scheme – 15% discount on APCs

Royal Society – membership scheme – 25% discount on APCs

Royal Society of Chemistry – prepayment (vouchers)

Sage Choice – prepayment – 25%

Wiley – prepayment – 25% discount on APCs

Summary

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | £ |
| **Block grant** | **679,711.33** |
| Sub-total paid to publishers | 205,779.14 |
| Sub-total of other expenditure | 34,702.46 |
| **Balance of block grant remaining** | **439,229.73** |

The block grant is calculated as the sum of the grant for April 2013 to March 2014 and for April 2014 to July 2014, pro rata sum from the allocation for April 2014 to March 2015.

## Annex B Publication level data

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Publications | Count |
| Number of peer-reviewed research papers arising from research council funded research that have been published by University of Southampton researchers  | 1499 |
| Papers compliant with RCUK policy by gold route | 350 |
| Papers compliant with RCUK policy by green route | 327 |

The report does not include the number of papers published in a journal which is not compliant with the RCUK policy on Open Access. We do not have the figure for this reporting period, as recording it was not originally requested, and our records are not in a form which enables us to identify this figure retrospectively.

This report should be read in conjunction with article level underlying data for green and gold compliant papers, <http://dx.doi.org/10.5258/SOTON/369449> and with the related report University of Southampton RCUK Policy on Open Access: call for evidence <http://eprints.soton.ac.uk/369447>

There have been some minor corrections to the first version of this report. Some false matches e.g. to the Australian Medical Research Council have been removed from the total. Some payments were wrongly attributed to Wiley instead of Elsevier which is now corrected; an error on an invoice overstating the number of articles against the cost has resulted in a slightly lower total of actual articles and the average APC costs given in the call for evidence report have altered slightly as a result. The APC totals for the Royal Society of Chemistry include the cost of voucher purchase.

