

Issues implementing OA

Workflow and Technical	Institutional Roles	Costs and Resources	Post-2014 REF	Publishers	Academic
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Linking information about publications – what has been funded? • Different internal and external systems • Linking data: publishers, funding, researchers • Technical interoperability • Versions! • System for easily ratifying if output meets OA criteria • Workflows – timing, acceptance • Workflows for dissemination of APC funds • Technical infrastructures, eg. lack of a CRIS • Dissemination as 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ‘It’s a university problem’ • OA not weaved through project from outset • Unclear institutional messages • OA as afterthought, not built into plans • Roles and responsibilities • Engagement with OA at senior levels in university • Most OA activity in library often doesn’t translate out to academics • PVC changes • Research office – lack of buy-in • Governances and leadership • Reaching the 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Connecting the dots between funding and OA (for academics) • Funding (!) • Cost benefit: value and risk • Library staff resource • Process of internal funding availability re: OA • Costs • Compliance with funder policies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The REF divide – where is incentive to do OA? • REF 2020: what should we be doing now to prepare? • Leads (eg. REF, institutional) not understanding why academics don’t do things properly!!! • Relationship with REF 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Publishers • Lack of OA options in some areas (nursing, law, business...) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Awareness of OA • Misconceptions • Academic interest • Awareness among academic staff of OA (and policies/ procedures) • OA knowledge for ECRs • Giving authors information about OA before they submit to a journal • Raising awareness of HEFCE/ future REF requirement • Academic concerns over fraud! • “I’m too busy” • Antipathy to the principle, or (misguided) loyalty to publishers • Academic understanding of OA processes – varied not

<p>individual activity</p>	<p>target audience – how to get a message to 1300 people</p>				<p>‘operational’</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Perception that OA can = poor journal • Academic awareness • Repository development • Academic compliance • Massive diversity of OA knowledge • Supportive of every researcher – career stage, subject area • Hostility – ‘Everyone who needs to read my research already does so’ • Lethargy when it comes to something new • ‘Too easy to publish’ • Idea that the author must choose high impact or OA • So many things for academics to understand
----------------------------	--	--	--	--	---

