Achieving an 'enlightened' publications policy at the University of Glasgow

Based on a presentation given at the UKSG seminar 'Mandating and the scholarly journal article: attracting interest on deposits?', London, 29 October 2008

The University of Glasgow has led the way in open access developments since 2001. This article charts the progress of open access at Glasgow through the development of the DAEDALUS Project in 2002 to the launch of the University's repository, Enlighten. Key factors leading to the recent announcement of a mandate for the deposit of research publications are discussed, including the impact of the Research Assessment Exercise (RAE) and the need for a central publications database at Glasgow.

MORAG GREIG
Advocacy Manager
(Enlighten), Library
University of Glasgow

Open access and repositories at Glasgow

The University of Glasgow has had a long-standing interest in open access and repositories. An early version of the ePrints software was installed in 2001, and an event on scholarly communications aimed at academics with speakers from the Scholarly Publishing and Academic Resources Coalition (SPARC)[1] was held in 2002. This early interest led to a successful bid to the JISC Focus on Access to Institutional Resources (FAIR) Programme[2], which resulted in the development of the three-year DAEDALUS Project[3].

The DAEDALUS Project

DAEDALUS was established to set up repositories at Glasgow and also to explore the various cultural, social, legal and technical issues relating to them. The project was based within the University Library, with technical input from staff in the University's IT Services Department. During the period of the project (2002-2005) library staff took the opportunity whenever it arose to raise open access issues with University senior management. While this did not have an immediately tangible outcome during the period of the project it was important in laying the groundwork for future policy developments.

Project staff were successful in persuading academics from a range of departments to deposit content, but it was very clear that significant amounts of content were never likely to be deposited unless a mandate was in place and unless deposit was built into working practices.

Development of Enlighten

Following the end of JISC funding, repository staff were keen to signal a move from a project to a University service. A first step was finding a new name for the repository and, after much thought, 'Enlighten' was chosen. Unlike DAEDALUS, this was not an acronym, and as well as being the name for the repository itself it was also intended to encompass the services provided by repository staff in areas such as mediated deposit, copyright checking and advice on funding body open access policies. Another critical element of the move from project to service was the backing of University senior management. At the end of the DAEDALUS Project it was clear that staff resources would be needed in order to continue to run the repository. A bid was therefore made for two new posts based within the library's Bibliographic Services Department. This bid was successful, and demonstrated

that library staff had been successful in persuading University management of the benefits of open access and repositories. This success was further demonstrated by the release by the University of a statement on open access in April 2006[4]. The statement outlined the benefits of open access and strongly encouraged staff to deposit their work into Enlighten. The statement was sent to all academic staff within the University, and the immediate impact was renewed interest in Enlighten and deposits from subject areas that had not previously deposited. However, it was not a mandate, as deposit was not required. At this stage it was felt that the University community was not yet ready to accept a mandate, and that more advocacy work needed to be done.

Electronic theses mandate

One of the areas of content investigated by the DAEDALUS Project had been PhD theses. During 2006, repository staff worked to persuade University management to move towards the adoption of a mandate for the deposit of electronic theses. Achieving this outcome proved to be a challenging and lengthy process, with many barriers needing to be overcome. In January 2007 a theses mandate was approved by the University Senate, which then came into force for all students at the beginning of the 2007/2008 academic session. The support of the University's Vice Principal for Research was vital in ensuring this outcome. As well as being an important achievement in its own right, the implementation of a theses mandate helped to pave the way for the development of a mandate for the deposit of research material.

Research Assessment Exercise

A critical factor in working towards a mandate for the University was the library's part in delivering the University's Research Assessment Exercise (RAE) return. The library took on responsibility for the RA2 (Research Output) aspect of the process. This was a major challenge as, despite efforts made following the 2001 RAE, the University did not have a central publications databases. Data was therefore provided in a wide range of formats including Reference Manager and EndNote databases, Microsoft Access databases, Microsoft Word

files and in-house databases. At the time of writing, the outcome of the RAE was not yet known, but the successful delivery of the publications data by library staff was hugely significant in convincing University management that the library could be trusted to manage the publications of the University. It was also very clear that the University urgently needed a central publications database.

Following the RAE return, the library was charged with developing this database. Repository staff were clear that it was important for Enlighten to play a central role, but spent some time discussing exactly what form this role should take. Two possible models were considered – using Enlighten and the ePrints software to form the basis of a publications database, or using another piece of software to fulfil this function and putting in place procedures to push data out to Enlighten, along with full text if possible. It was felt that opting to use a separate software package might run the risk of side-lining Enlighten, and also causing confusion amongst academics as to why there were two separate systems associated with publications. On the other hand, turning Enlighten into a publications database made it very likely that it would quickly become a large database of metadata-only records with very little full text. The latter is an issue that repository staff have wrestled with ever since the inception of the DAEDALUS Project. When the repository was first established, it was fully anticipated that it would consist entirely of records with associated full text. It soon became clear that there were practical reasons why this might not be possible, e.g. authors did not have suitable copies of older papers, or could not get publisher permission, but still wanted all of their publications to be listed. During the project, metadata-only records were therefore accepted. At the end of the project, concerns were raised about the proportion of full text records to metadata-only records, and at this stage the decision was taken to revert to accepting only full text. A decision to return again to accepting some metadata-only records would be yet another reversal.

Ultimately it was agreed that the benefits of positioning Enlighten as the University's publications database would outweigh any possible disadvantages. It would allow Enlighten to be positioned as a key University service, and would mean that staff would have a clear idea of what the repository was for. It also presented the opportunity

to engage in discussions with University management about the possibility of developing a mandate.

Moves towards a mandate

As part of the process of developing a central publications database, library staff undertook a series of meetings with representatives of all University departments to establish how it might be possible for them to interact with Enlighten. The idea of full text being deposited at the same time was also raised. Reactions from staff were very positive – they seemed have a clear idea of why it was necessary to introduce a central publications database, and could see the benefits of depositing full text. The strong working relationships developed during the RAE data collection period were a key factor in this ready acceptance and willingness to co-operate with what was being proposed, and the main question being asked was 'how?' rather than 'why?'.

During the planning for a central publications database the opportunity arose to meet with the Vice Principal for Research to discuss the possibility of a mandate for research publications. The recently announced Harvard mandate[5] along with mandates adopted by fellow Scottish institutions (the University of Stirling[6] and Queen Margaret University[7]) had further smoothed the way, and it was agreed that the time was right to propose a Glasgow mandate. Senior management were convinced of the benefit of making Glasgow research as widely available as possible, and changing local attitudes to open access would hopefully lead to the acceptance of such a mandate. Following this meeting the Vice Principal asked for a paper to be prepared for the June 2008 meeting of the University Senate.

University Publications Policy

The paper presented to the University Senate covered three separate areas. In relation to full text, it was proposed that from the beginning of academic session 2008/2009 all staff should be required to deposit a copy of peer-reviewed journal articles and conference proceedings into Enlighten where publisher copyright agreements permitted. The proposal also called for the bibliographic details of all research outputs to be made available in Enlighten. A third aspect of the proposal covered forms of address in journal articles, and outlined a standard form of University address to be used by all staff. The proposal was therefore broader in scope than simply a mandate for full text deposit. Within the proposal itself the term 'mandate' was not used – this was a deliberate decision, as it was felt that the term had potentially negative connotations, and might have a corresponding effect on staff. Given that the policy also incorporated elements other than the full text deposit, it was agreed that it should be referred to as the University's 'Publications Policy' rather than as the 'mandate'. This does potentially open up the possibility of misinterpretation of the requirement to deposit, but the wording of the policy itself is very clear.

The issue of going a step further and requiring staff, or indeed the University, to retain copyright of journal articles and not assign this to publishers was discussed. It was felt that at present this would be a step too far – it would potentially be seen as a loss of academic control and an attempt to dictate where authors were able to publish. It was agreed that it would not be a useful move to incorporate this into the policy at this stage.

The policy was presented to the University Senate at its June 2008 meeting[8] and was passed with no objections. There were supportive comments from a number of members of the Senate, and questions asked related only to practicalities.

Practicalities

Because of the decision to use Enlighten as a publications database, and in order to work within the context of existing procedures for collecting publications data within departments and faculties, three models of deposit are available. Some academics will self-deposit directly into Enlighten; in other departments a member of administrative staff will carry out deposit on behalf of academics. Where departments or faculties have long-standing publications databases and wish to maintain these locally, data can be imported into Enlighten. In this instance authors will be asked to e-mail copies of the papers to a dedicated deposit e-mail address, and repository staff will attach it to the relevant record. Procedures are being put in place for dealing with instances

where authors have already deposited in a subject-based repository such as UK PubMed Central[9] or arXiv[10].

Future developments

Looking towards the immediate future, although a mandate is now in place there is still a lot of work to be done. Evidence from institutions with existing mandates shows that the adoption of such a policy is not an automatic guarantee that authors will all immediately comply. At the current time Enlighten is being upgraded to the latest version of the ePrints software – this will offer additional functionality, both for end-users and for repository staff. Work is being carried out with the University's web team to set up automated feeds from Enlighten to staff personal web pages. It is anticipated that this will act as an incentive to staff to ensure that their publications in Enlighten are up to date. This work has also involved collaboration with colleagues in Management Information Services on the inclusion of staff IDs within records in Enlighten. Work to add retrospective publications data using databases produced for the RAE will also be carried out.

Conclusions

A number of key factors have emerged in explaining how the current state of play has been achieved. Getting to this point has taken a long time, and has involved significant patience and perseverance – willingness to keep repeating the message and not give up. Equally important have been the relationships developed with key people in the University and the gaining of their trust. The RAE and forthcoming Research Excellence Framework have been critical in this respect, but also as drivers for making Glasgow's research as widely available as possible. The influence of mandates developed by other institutions and by funding bodies has also been important.

Having the Publications Policy in place is in many ways a beginning rather than the end – it is another step along the way on a journey that started in 2001. Only time will tell if the policy is working, and as yet the issue of what to do if the policy fails to bear fruit has not been addressed. However, the inclusion of Enlighten as one of the University's Research Strategy Key Performance Indicators places Enlighten firmly in the centre of the University's research framework and planning. It is very satisfying that several years of advocacy have resulted in the achievement of a mandate and hopefully we are well on the way to open access enlightenment at Glasgow.

References

1. Scholarly Publishing and Academic Resources Coalition:
    http://www.arl.org/sparc/ (Accessed 8 January 2009)

2. JISC Focus on Access to Institutional Resources (FAIR) Programme:
    http://www.jisc.ac.uk/whatwedo/programmes/fair.aspx (Accessed 8 January 2009)

3. DAEDALUS Project:
    http://www.lib.gla.ac.uk/daedalus/ (Accessed 8 January 2009)

4. University of Glasgow Open Access Statement April 2006:
    http://www.lib.gla.ac.uk/enlighten/statement.html (Accessed 8 January 2009)

5. Faculty of Arts and Sciences Harvard University mandate:
    http://www.fas.harvard.edu/~secfas/February_2008_Agenda.pdf (Accessed 8 January 2009)

6. University of Stirling Online Research Policy:
    http://www.is.stir.ac.uk/research/repository/eprint-policy.php (Accessed 8 January 2009)

7. Queen Margaret University policy:
    http://www.eprints.org/openaccess/policysignup/fullinfo.php?inst=Queen%20Margaret%20University,%20Edinburgh (Accessed 8 January 2009)

8. University of Glasgow Publications Policy
    http://www.lib.gla.ac.uk/enlighten/publicationspolicy/index.html (Accessed 8 January 2009)

9. UK PubMed Central:
    http://ukpmc.ac.uk/ (Accessed 8 January 2009)

10. arXiv:
    http://arxiv.org (Accessed 8 January 2009)

Article © Morag Greig

■ **Morag Greig**
Advocacy Manager (Enlighten)
Library
University of Glasgow
Hillhead Street
Glasgow G12 8QE, UK
E-mail: m.greig@lib.gla.ac.uk
Tel: +44 (0)141 330 6797

To view the original copy of this article, published in *Serials*, the journal of the UKSG, click here:

http://serials.uksg.org/openurl.asp?genre=article&issn=0953-0460&volume=22&issue=1&spage=7

The DOI for this article is 10.1629/227. Click here to access via DOI:

http://dx.doi.org/10.1629/227

For a link to the table of contents for the issue of *Serials* in which this article first appeared, click here:

http://serials.uksg.org/openurl.asp?genre=issue&issn=0953-0460&volume=22&issue=1