Good Practices For University Open-Access Policies

Edited by
Stuart Shieber and Peter Suber
2013-09-30

HARVARD OPEN ACCESS PROJECT

Berkman
The Berkman Center for Internet & Society
at Harvard University

Contents

Foreword

We have worked directly for many years with colleagues at many institutions on policies to facilitate open access to faculty research. We began writing this guide in 2011 to codify the kind of advice we found ourselves repeating, make it available to more institutions than we could ever reach directly, and solicit the help of others in making it more comprehensive and useful.

We published the first version in October 2012, and have steadily enlarged and improved it since then. We keep the master version on a wiki to make this kind of continual revision easy for us. However, some users prefer to read or share the guide in other formats, and we're pleased to release the first print and PDF editions. Like the wiki version, these new versions stand under CC-BY licenses.

The wiki version will continue to evolve, but these versions capture the text as it stood on September 26, 2013.

The guide is a product of the Harvard Open Access Project (HOAP). We're grateful to Arcadia, which funds HOAP, to the Berkman Center for Internet & Society, which administers it, and to the many colleagues who have generously shared their comments and expertise with us. We also thank our fellow principal investigators on HOAP, Robert Darnton, William Fisher, Urs Gasser, Colin Maclay, Phil Malone, John Palfrey, and Jonathan Zittrain; the past and present Berkman project coordinators for HOAP, Adam Holland and Kenny Whitebloom; and the past and present HOAP research assistants, Andrea Bernard, Cherone Duggan, Emily Kilcer, and Amanda Page.

For the latest updates, as well as details on how to obtain a print or PDF copy of the guide, see the master version at http://bit.ly/goodoa[1].

    Stuart Shieber and Peter Suber

    September 2013

Preface

This is a guide to good practices for university open-access (OA) policies. It's based on the type of policy adopted at Harvard, Stanford, MIT, U of Kansas, U of Oregon, Trinity, Oberlin, Rollins, Wake Forest, Duke, U of Puerto Rico, Hawaii - Manoa, Columbia, Strathmore, Emory, Princeton, Jomo Kenyatta, Utah State, Bifröst, Miami, California - San Francisco, the U Massachusetts Medical School, Rutgers, Georgia Tech, and many other institutions. (See p. 66) However, it includes recommendations that should be useful to universities taking other approaches.

The guide is designed to evolve. No early version will cover every point on which good practices would be desirable or might be discernible. We plan to revise and enlarge it over time, building on our own experience and the experience of colleagues elsewhere. We welcome suggestions.

The guide was in the works for several years before the first public version launched[2] in October 2012. It's one small part of the larger effort described in Recommendation 4.2 of the ten-year anniversary statement of the Budapest Open Access Initiative[3] (September 2012): Supporters of open access "should develop guidelines to universities and funding agencies considering OA policies, including recommended policy terms, best practices, and answers to frequently asked questions."

We deliberately call our recommendations "good practices" rather than "best practices". On many points, there are multiple, divergent good practices. Good practices can change as circumstances change, and as we learn more. Good practices are easier to identify than best practices. And there can be wider agreement on which practices are good than on which practices are best.

We hope the guide will be useful to institutions considering an OA policy, and to faculty, students, librarians, and administrators who would like their institution to start considering one.

The guide is written and edited by Stuart Shieber[4] and Peter Suber[5].

- **Stuart** is a Professor of Computer Science and the Faculty Director of the Harvard Office for Scholarly Communication.

- **Peter** is the Director of the Harvard Office for Scholarly Communication, Director of the Harvard Open Access Project, and Faculty Fellow at the Berkman Center for Internet & Society. The guide reflects their views as individuals, not necessarily those of Harvard University.

- **Emily Kilcer** researched and wrote the section on filling the repository. (See p. 31) Emily is a Project Coordinator at the Harvard Office for Scholarly Communication and Research Assistant at the Harvard Open Access Project.

We thank the following colleagues and organizations for their support, and hope to enlarge both lists over time. Please [contact us](#)[6] if you or your organization may be interested. Readers should not assume that consulting experts and endorsing organizations support every recommendation in the guide.

- The guide has been written in consultation with these expert colleagues:

  - » **Isabel Bernal,** Manager of institutional repository DIGITAL.CSIC, Spanish National Research Council (Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, CSIC)

  - » **Amy Brand,** Assistant Provost for Faculty Appointments and Information, and Special Advisor to the Office for Scholarly Communication, Harvard University

  - » **Ellen Finnie Duranceau,** Program Manager, Scholarly Publishing and Licensing, MIT Libraries

  - » **Ada Emmett,** 2012-2013 Visiting Associate Professor of Library and Information Science and Special Assistant to the Dean for Scholarly Communications, Purdue University; Scholarly Communications Program Head, University of Kansas (KU) Libraries, and Chair of the KU Open Access Task Force

  - » **Heather Joseph,** Executive Director of the Scholarly Publishing and Academic Resources Coalition (SPARC)

  - » **Iryna Kuchma,** Open Access Programme Manager of Electronic Information for Libraries (EIFL)

  - » **Alma Swan,** Convenor of Enabling Open Scholarship (EOS), Director of European Advocacy for SPARC Europe, and Director of Key Perspectives

- The guide is endorsed by these projects and organizations:
  - » Coalition of Open Access Policy Institutions[7] (COAPI)
  - » Confederation of Open Access Repositories[8] (COAR)
  - » Electronic Information for Libraries[9] (EIFL)
  - » Enabling Open Scholarship[10] (EOS)
  - » Harvard Open Access Project[11] (HOAP)
  - » Mediterranean Open Access Network[12] (MedOANet)
  - » Open Access Directory (OAD)[13]
  - » Open Access Implementation Group[14] (OAIG)
  - » Open Access Scholarly Information Sourcebook[15] (OASIS)
  - » Scholarly Publishing and Academic Resources Coalition[16] (SPARC)
  - » SPARC Europe[17]

Drafting a policy

CONTENTS

1. WHAT AN OA POLICY CAN ACHIEVE

In this guide, we present our understanding of good practices for university open-access policies. An effective OA policy can build support for OA, as an academic and social good, into standard university practice.

As we discuss below, we prefer a policy of the sort now in place at many universities that provides for automatic default rights retention in scholarly articles and a commitment to provide copies of articles for open distribution. Policies of this sort have many benefits: they allow authors to retain extremely broad use and reuse rights with a minimum of effort; they allow universities to help authors in openly distributing articles for maximum impact; they allow other

researchers and the general public to obtain broader access to articles; all while preserving academic freedom, author choice, and consistency with copyright and other law.

Although we find this kind of policy preferable, alternative sorts of policies can also be effective, and we discuss them as well. Other kinds of policies we find counterproductive, and recommend avoiding them.

2. STATEMENT OF GOALS OF THE POLICY

Many policies open with some statement of the policy goals. There is no "best practice" statement of the benefits of OA or the goals of promoting OA. But there are some mistakes to avoid.

- Don't say that the purpose of the policy is "only", "solely", or "exclusively" to achieve one benefit of OA, or some particular list of benefits. Leave the door open to achieve all the benefits of OA, even if you are not ready to enumerate them all.

- See the entry below on transferring rights back to the author. (See p. 16) Avoid language in the preamble that could inadvertently restrict the institution, authors, or users in making use of works in the repository. For example, avoid language that might be construed to bar text mining or derivative works.

3. TYPES OF POLICY

There are at least six types of university OA policy. Here we organize them by their methods for avoiding copyright troubles.

1. The policy grants the institution certain non-exclusive rights to future research articles published by faculty. This sort of policy typically offers a waiver option or opt-out for authors. It also requires deposit in the repository.

   » We recommend type #1 in this guide. Most of the good practices collected here are about that sort of policy.

2. The policy requires faculty to retain certain non-exclusive rights when they publish future research articles. Whether or not it offers a waiver option for authors, it requires deposit in the repository.

» We do not recommend #2 because it requires faculty to negotiate with publishers in order to retain the needed rights. That is difficult to do. Many faculty are intimidated by the prospect and will not to do it. Even if all tried it, some will succeed and some will fail. Some will get one set of rights and some will get another. That will make access uneven and multiply implementation headaches.

3. The policy seeks no rights at all, but requires deposit in the repository. If the institution already has permission to make the work OA, then it makes it OA from the moment of deposit. Otherwise the deposit will be "dark" (non-OA) (See p. 24) until the institution can obtain permission to make it OA. During the period of dark deposit, at least the metadata will be OA.

» When type #1 policies are politically unattainable on a certain campus, then we recommend type #3. We put #1 ahead of #3 because it actually provides permission to make articles OA through the repository.

4. The policy seeks no rights at all and does not require dark deposits. It requires repository deposit and OA, but only when the author's publisher permits them.

» We do not recommend #4 because it allows recalcitrant publishers to opt out at will. Some institutions believe that a loophole for recalcitrant publishers is the only way to avoid copyright infringement. But that is mistaken. All six approaches listed here, properly implemented, avoid copyright infringement.

» Similarly, some institutions believe that an opt-out for authors, as in #1, is the same as an opt-out for publishers, as in #4. But that is also mistaken. Publishers have reasons or incentives to opt out far more often than authors.

5. The policy does not require OA in any sense, but merely requests or encourages it.

» When #1 and #3 are both politically unattainable on a certain campus, we recommend either a type #5 policy or waiting until the community is ready for a type #1 or #3 policy.

6. The policy does not require OA in any sense, but asks faculty to "opt in" to a policy under which they are expected to deposit their work in the repository and authorize it to be OA.

» We do not recommend #6 because it is equivalent to no policy at all. Faculty may already opt in to the practice of self-archiving and OA. This sort of policy differs little from #5 except by leaving the impression that asking faculty to opt in to an OA policy is somehow different from requesting or encouraging OA itself.

For independent analyses concluding that type #1 policies are lawful, and provide legally sufficient permission for OA through the institutional repository, see:

- Simon Frankel and Shannon Nestor, Opening the Door: How Faculty Authors Can Implement an Open Access Policy at Their Institutions,[18] a white paper from SPARC and Science Commons, August 2010. The paper shows how OA policies can avoid legal pitfalls, and uses the Harvard and MIT policies as a model.

- Eric Priest, Copyright and the Harvard Open Access Mandate,[19] *Northwestern Journal of Technology and Intellectual Property,* preprint August 1, 2012, published version forthcoming. Also see Stuart Shieber's blog post on Priest's article, Is the Harvard open-access policy legally sound?[20] *The Occasional Pamphlet,* September 17, 2012.

On our preference for type #1 and type #3 policies over the other four types, see Recommendation 1.1 from the BOAI-10 statement[21] (September 2012): "When publishers will not allow OA on the university's preferred terms, we recommend either of two courses. The policy may require dark or non-OA deposit in the institutional repository until permission for OA can be obtained. Or the policy may grant the institution a nonexclusive right to make future faculty research articles OA through the institutional repository (with or without the option for faculty to waive this grant of rights for any given publication)."

4. GRANT OF RIGHTS TO THE INSTITUTION

The policy should be worded so that the act of adopting the policy is the same as the act of granting the university certain non-exclusive rights. The policy should not merely ask, encourage, or require faculty to retain certain rights in the future, when they sign publishing agreements, and then grant them to the institution. It should say "Each faculty member grants...", or "hereby grants...", not "will grant..." or "must grant...."

By granting the rights at the time of the vote for the policy, in advance of future publications, the policy frees faculty from the need to negotiate with publishers. It secures the rights even when faculty fail to request them. It secures the same rights for every faculty member, not just the rights that a given faculty member might succeed in obtaining from a given negotiation with a given publisher.

Some policies start with the grant of rights that we recommend, but then muddy the waters with confusing or even inconsistent additional language.

- One mistake is to follow the grant of rights with a provision encouraging faculty to negotiate with publishers to retain some or all of the same rights already granted to the institution. This is confusing because one purpose of the grant of rights is to make that kind of negotiation unnecessary. The two clauses might even be inconsistent, one making negotiation unnecessary for OA, and the other implying that negotiation is necessary. (A negotiation clause would be more justified if it aimed to insure that authors only sign contracts consistent with the policy; for more on this, see our entry on author addenda, p. 23.)

- Another mistake is to follow the grant of rights with a provision creating a loophole for publishers whose publication agreements, or in-house copyright policies, do not allow OA on the university's terms. This is confusing because one purpose of the grant of rights is to close exactly that sort of loophole. The two clauses might even be inconsistent, one implying that publishers have no opt-out (except by requiring authors to obtain waivers) (See p. 64), and other implying that publishers may opt out at will.

Note that in what follows we'll often refer to the grant of rights as the "license" or "permission" for OA.

5. DEPOSIT IN THE REPOSITORY

The policy should either require deposit of relevant work in the institutional repository, or require making relevant work available to the institution for deposit.

The waiver option should apply only to the grant of rights, not to deposit in the repository. (More under waivers below.) (See p. 64)

The policy needn't require faculty to make deposits themselves. The

deposits may be made by others (such as student workers) on behalf of faculty, provided that faculty make the appropriate versions (See p. 25) of their articles available for deposit. For simplicity in what follows, we will refer to depositors as faculty, but will mean to include others acting on behalf of faculty.

6. DEPOSITED VERSION

The policy should specify that the deposited version should be the final version of the author's peer-reviewed manuscript. This version contains the text approved by peer review. It should also include all the charts, graphics, and illustrations which the author has permission to deposit. It may include post-review copy-editing done collaboratively between author and journal. It need not include any post-review copy editing done unilaterally by the journal, the journal's pagination, or the journal's look and feel.

If the publisher consents, then the institution should deposit the published version of an article to complement the final version of the author's peer-reviewed manuscript already on deposit.

- This could be mentioned in the policy itself or simply made an implementation practice.

- The published version should only replace the author's manuscript when the published version allows at least as many reuse rights as the author's manuscript. Some publishers will be happy to make this substitution in order to prevent the circulation of multiple versions. However, when the published version carries a more restrictive license than the author's manuscript, then the author's manuscript should not be removed from the repository.

- Sherpa RoMEO[22] keeps a list of publishers willing to allow deposit of the published version.

7. DEPOSIT TIMING

The policy should require faculty to deposit their peer-reviewed manuscripts at the time of acceptance for publication, or no later than the date of publication.

If an author specifies an embargo (See p. 14) on a given article, the deposit should still be made between the time of acceptance and the time of publication. But it will be a dark deposit (See p. 21) until the embargo period expires.

8. WAIVER OPTION

The policy should make clear that the institution will always grant waivers, no questions asked. Faculty needn't meet a burden of proof or offer a justification which might be accepted or rejected. To prevent needless fear or confusion on this point, the policy should refer to "obtaining" a waiver, or "directing" that a waiver be granted, rather than "requesting" a waiver.

To allay potential faculty concerns that an institution may override a waiver in the future, the waiver should contain language that it may not be revoked by the institution.

The waiver option should apply only to the grant of rights to the institution (also called the license or the permission), not to the deposit in the repository. Faculty should deposit their articles in the repository even if they obtain waivers. At least initially these would be dark or non-OA deposits. (See p. 21)

Faculty who want waivers for separate publications should obtain separate waivers. Institutions should not offer "standing waivers" that apply to all future publications from a given faculty member. Standing waivers would defeat the purpose of shifting the default to permission for OA.

A waiver for a particular article means that the institution does not receive the policy's usual bundle of non-exclusive rights for that article. Hence, for that article the university will not have permission from the policy to provide OA. But the university may have permission from another source, such as the author (who may have retained rights from the publisher). For example, if the publisher allows green OA six months after publication, then the university will eventually have OA permission even if it doesn't have OA permission under the policy. If the university has a copy of the article on dark deposit (See p. 21) in the repository, then it may make the repository copy OA as soon as the publisher allows. Hence, the waiver provision of the policy should not promise that the university will never make a copy OA. On the contrary, the policy might say that the university will make faculty work OA whenever it has permission to do so.

Some supporters of OA worry that a waiver option will make the policy ineffective. They worry that the waiver rate will be high, for example, above 50%. However, the experience at every school with a waiver option is that the waiver rate is low. At both Harvard and MIT it's below 5%.

- Omitting a waiver option would limit faculty freedom to submit new work to the journals or publishers of their choice. Including a waiver option restores that freedom but without impeding OA. The kind of policy we recommend shifts the default to OA. It uses faculty inertia to support OA rather than to support standard copyright transfers which give the OA decision to publishers. Faculty who worry that a waiver option entails a high waiver rate should not underestimate the power of shifting the default. It can and does change behavior on a large scale.

Also see the entry on waivers, p. 64 in the section on Talking about a policy.

9. EMBARGO OPTION

The policy may also give authors the right to specify an embargo period (a delay in the open distribution of an article).

The [Duke policy][23] is a model here: "The Provost or Provost's designate will waive application of the license for a particular article or delay access for a specified period of time upon written request by a Faculty member."

- Harvard's [Model Open Access Policy][24] incorporates the Duke language with this annotation: "Duke University pioneered the incorporation of an author-directed embargo period for particular articles as a way of adhering to publisher wishes without requiring a full waiver. This allows the full range of rights to be taken advantage of after the embargo period ends, rather than having to fall back on what the publisher may happen to allow. Since this is still an opt-out option, it does not materially weaken the policy. An explicit mention of embargoes in this way may appeal to faculty members as an acknowledgement of the prevalence of embargoes in journals they are familiar with."

When faculty specify an embargo period, they should still deposit their articles in the repository on the usual timetable. (See p. 12) The embargo option allows a delay in making a deposited article OA, not a delay in depositing an article.

We recommend against any policy language, or implementation practice, requiring the university to respect a given embargo period for all articles from a given journal or publisher. For more details, see the entry on treaties with publishers. (See p. 21)

10. SCOPE OF COVERAGE, BY CONTENT CATEGORY

The policy should specify what categories of content are covered by the license and the expectation of deposit. In particular, the policy should cover scholarly articles, or the kinds of writings typically published in peer-reviewed journals and conference proceedings.

The policy should not cover writings not considered scholarly in the field (in most fields, op-ed pieces, popular articles) or scholarly writings that generate royalties (textbooks, monographs).

The Harvard [model policy][25] covers "scholarly articles" alone, and explains in this annotation:

> What constitutes a scholarly article is purposefully left vague. Clearly falling within the scope of the term are (using terms from the Budapest Open Access Initiative)[26] articles that describe the fruits of scholars' research and that they give to the world for the sake of inquiry and knowledge without expectation of payment. Such articles are typically presented in peer-reviewed scholarly journals and conference proceedings. Clearly falling outside of the scope are a wide variety of other scholarly writings such as books and commissioned articles, as well as popular writings, fiction and poetry, and pedagogical materials (lecture notes, lecture videos, case studies).

> Often, faculty express concern that the term is not (and cannot be) precisely defined. The concern is typically about whether one or another particular case falls within the scope of the term or not. However, the exact delineation of every case is neither possible nor necessary. In particular, if the concern is that a particular article inappropriately falls within the purview of the policy, a waiver can always be obtained.

> One tempting clarification is to refer to scholarly articles more specifically as "articles published in peer-reviewed journals or conference proceedings" or some such specification. Doing so may have an especially pernicious unintended consequence: With such a definition, a "scholarly article" doesn't become covered by the policy until it is published, by which time a publication agreement covering its disposition is likely to already have been signed. Thus the entire benefit of the policy's nonexclusive license *preceding* a *later* transfer of rights may be vitiated. If

clarifying language along these lines is required, simultaneously weaker and more accurate language can be used, for instance, this language from Harvard's explanatory material (also used above): "Using terms from the Budapest Open Access Initiative, faculty's scholarly articles are articles that describe the fruits of their research and that they give to the world for the sake of inquiry and knowledge without expectation of payment. Such articles are typically presented in peer-reviewed scholarly journals and conference proceedings."

Works not covered by the policy can still be placed in a repository, and with permission they can be made OA. The policy or separate implementation documents can encourage deposit of other kinds of work that fall outside the scope of the license and deposit requirement.

11. SCOPE OF COVERAGE, BY TIME

Neither the grant of rights nor the deposit requirement should be retroactive. Under the kind of policy we recommend here, faculty can only make the desired grant rights to the institution for future, still-unpublished works, not for previously published works.

However, the policy or separate implementation documents might encourage deposit of works completed prior to the adoption of the policy.

12. TRANSFERRING RIGHTS BACK TO THE AUTHOR

The kind of policy we recommend here not only provides rights to the institution, but allows the institution to transfer those rights to others. Here's the key language (from the Harvard model policy)[27]: "More specifically, each Faculty member grants to [university name] a nonexclusive, irrevocable, worldwide license to exercise any and all rights under copyright relating to each of his or her scholarly articles...*and to authorize others to do the same*" (emphasis added).

The primary purpose of this language is to allow the institution to transfer rights back to the author. The effect is that authors retain (or regain) certain rights to their work, including rights that they might have transferred away in their publishing contracts.

For this reason, the set of rights transferred to the institution should be as broad as possible, so that the author thereby retains or regains the broadest possible set of rights.

Although the kind of policy we recommend here can correctly be called a rights-retention policy, it doesn't provide direct or simple rights retention *by authors*. Instead, authors transfer certain non-exclusive rights to the institution. After the author signs a publishing agreement, and depending on its precise terms, the author only regains or retains certain rights if the institution transfers them back to the author.

13. TRANSFERRING RIGHTS TO OTHERS

Authors subject to this kind of policy may still sign publishing contracts with publishers. The policy grants certain non-exclusive rights to the institution, and authors should not sign contracts giving the same rights to publishers (or other parties). However, they will seldom need to do so. The vast majority of publishers agree that authors need not obtain waivers from this kind of OA policy for publishers to obtain the rights they need for publication. In any case, when authors do wish to sign such a contract, they may obtain a waiver from the policy, no questions asked.

For detail on alerting publishers to the rights already granted by the policy to the institution, see the entry on author addenda. (See p. 23) For detail on waiving the grant of rights to the institution for a given work, see the entry on waivers. (See p. 64)

14. ENHANCING USER RIGHTS

Authors subject to this kind policy may use open licenses, such as Creative Commons licenses,[28] to enhance user rights. The kind of policy we recommend here is compatible with the use of open licenses but does not require them. Institutions may adopt this kind of policy and decide afterwards when or whether to make use of open licenses. Similarly, it may adopt this kind of policy and leave authors free to make these decisions on their own, case by case.

Harvard does not routinely put open licenses on individual deposits. Instead, the terms of use[29] for its repository function as an open license for all deposits.

15. IMPLEMENTATION PROCESS

The policy should include a provision giving a certain committee or unit responsibility for implementing the policy.

A policy is more likely to pass if it only says what it has to say. Other details can be left to the committee charged with implementing the policy.

When building support for a policy makes it desirable to share both the draft policy language and the implementation plan, make sure to keep the two distinct. That way the policy itself is not enlarged to include the implementation plan, and it can say only what it has to say.

16. SEPARATING THE ISSUES

A university requiring green OA (deposit in OA repositories) may also encourage gold OA (publishing in OA journals). But it should be careful about doing both the same document. Where it has been tried, faculty too easily come to believe that the policy requires gold OA, and thereby limits their freedom to submit new work to the journals of their choice.

A university with a green OA policy may (and we think, should) also launch a fund[30] to help faculty pay publication fees at fee-based OA journals. But the green OA policy should make clear that it is separate from the journal fund. Otherwise faculty may think that the policy itself requires faculty to submit new work to OA journals, a common and harmful misunderstanding.

We offer some other recommendations on separating the issues in the section on "Adopting a policy."

Adopting a policy

CONTENTS

1. ADOPTING AUTHORITY

The policy should be adopted by the faculty, not the administration.

Campus entrepreneurs leading the campaign for a policy should be faculty. If the idea and initial momentum came from librarians or administrators, they should find faculty members willing to lead the effort.

Because the policy will apply to faculty more than others, it should be a faculty initiative and should be perceived to be a faculty initiative. Otherwise, many faculty will suspect or object that they are being coerced. The question should be what faculty want for themselves.

2. EDUCATING FACULTY ABOUT THE POLICY BEFORE THE VOTE

Make clear that the policy requires deposit in an OA repository, not submission to an OA journal. (It's about green OA, not gold OA.) It does not limit faculty freedom to submit work to the journals of their choice.

Make clear that the waiver option guarantees that faculty are free to decide for or against OA for each of their publications. The policy merely shifts the default from non-deposit and non-OA to deposit and OA.

Make clear that "softening" the policy to *opt-in* is pointless. All institutions without opt-out policies already have opt-in policies. Faculty at schools without policies may always opt in to the practice of making their work (green or gold) OA.

Make clear that the waiver option also gives publishers the right to require a waiver as a condition of publication. Hence, publishers who decide that publishing authors bound by an OA policy is too risky, or that the costs exceed the benefits, may protect themselves at will simply by requiring waivers. Moreover, they may protect themselves without refusing to publish faculty bound by OA policies. Hence, faculty who worry about the policy's effect on certain favorite publishers, such as society publishers, needn't paternalize those publishers by voting down a proposed policy. Instead they should understand that the policy already gives those publishers the means to protect themselves, if they feel the need to do so. (Few, by the way, feel the need to do so; the number is in the low single digits at Harvard and MIT.)

- Faculty who want to take an extra step to protect certain publishers should explain to them how the waiver option enables them to protect themselves. Some publishers may not understand that. In our experience, publishers who object to university OA policies either assume that all such policies are unwaivable, or do not take the waiver option into account.

Also see the recommendations on Talking about a policy. (See p. 60)

Here are some FAQs used to explain policies to faculty:

- University of California, San Francisco, before adoption FAQ[31] and after adoption FAQ[32]
- Columbia University[33]
- Duke University[34]
- Harvard University[35]
- MIT[36]
- Stanford University School of Education[37]

3. OTHER TIPS FOR THE ADOPTION PROCESS

Toward the end of the drafting process, and during the whole of the campus education process, the drafting committee should host a series of face-to-face meetings to answer questions and objections. Don't rush the vote. Keep holding these meetings until faculty stop coming.

Where it would help (and only where it would help), point out how a draft policy uses language successfully adopted and implemented elsewhere. Some faculty are not aware of the number of successful policies elsewhere. Some may think the institution is sailing in uncharted waters. Some may strengthen their original OA motivation with the desire to cooperate or compete with certain peer institutions.

Implementing a policy

CONTENTS

1. LAUNCHING A REPOSITORY

The institution must have an institutional repository, or participate in a consortial repository. Most schools launch a repository before adopting a policy to fill it, but some do it the other way around.

2. INDIVIDUALIZED WRITING

Institutions implementing the kind of policy recommended here will want the policy to prevail over a later publishing contract inconsistent with the policy. Merely passing the policy may attain that goal.

However, to be more certain, practically and legally, that the policy license survives any later transfer, US institutions should get authors to sign a "written instrument" affirming the policy.

- Here's why: Under US copyright law ([17 USC 205.e](#))[38] a "nonexclusive license...prevails over a conflicting transfer of copyright ownership if the license is evidenced by a written instrument signed by the owner of the rights licensed or such owner's duly authorized agent."

- This provision doesn't say that in the absence of a written instrument, the nonexclusive license will *not* prevail over a later contract inconsistent with the policy. A university might take the position that the nonexclusive license in the policy will prevail in any case, and will probably never have to test its position in court. But to be safe, it's best to get a written affirmation of the grant of rights (or license) as specified by 17 USC 205.e.

- We don't know how to accomplish this goal outside the US, and welcome advice from people who do know.

Harvard uses several methods to get the written affirmation of the policy. When faculty deposit their own articles, a dialog box in the deposit process asks them to affirm the grant of rights (the license) in the policy. When someone else (an administrative assistant or the Office for Scholarly Communication) deposits articles on their behalf, the faculty member must first have signed a one-time *assistance authorization form* containing an affirmation of the grant of rights. Thus, whatever route an article takes into the repository, the institution obtains a written affirmation of the license.

- Here's Harvard's language for affirming the license is: "[I] f I am a member of a Harvard Faculty or School that has adopted an open access policy found at http://osc. hul.harvard.edu/, this confirms my grant to Harvard of a non-exclusive license with respect to my scholarly articles as set forth in that policy."

3. FACILITATING WAIVERS

The institution should create a web form through which faculty can obtain waivers. This not only streamlines bookkeeping, but proves to faculty that the process is easy and automatic. Harvard can share code for such a web form.

Some publishers may require faculty to obtain a waiver as a condition of publication. Institutions need not try to prevent this. Accommodating these publisher policies proves that publishers have the means to protect themselves, if they choose to use them, and that fact makes it unnecessary for faculty to protect or "paternalize" their favorite publishers (e.g. society publishers) by voting against a proposed policy. On the other hand, the institution may want to talk with publishers who take this position, to see whether they can work out an accommodation.

4. AUTHOR ADDENDA

An [author addendum](http://bit.ly/GPmAXb) <http://bit.ly/GPmAXb> is one way for authors to retain rights that a standard publishing contract would otherwise give to the publisher. For policies of the kind we recommend, author addenda are unnecessary for rights retention, for the same reason that individual author-publisher negotiations are unnecessary. The institution has the rights needed for OA directly from the policy. Hence, faculty need not obtain those rights from publishers.

However, author addenda may be desirable anyway. An addendum can alert the publisher that the author's institution already possesses certain non-exclusive rights. This can prevent misunderstandings on each side. It can also prevent authors from signing publisher contracts which (without the addendum) are inconsistent with the university's OA policy.

See the section on individualized writing (See p. 21) above for the reasons why a well-implemented institutional OA policy would take priority over a later publishing contract inconsistent with the policy. Because the policy takes priority, authors who sign publishing contracts inconsistent with the policy may be unable to live up to those contracts and may expose themselves to liability for breach of contract. This risk is entirely eliminated by an addendum modifying the contract to conform to the terms of the institutional policy.

- Note, however, that there may be no risk to eliminate. Under some legal theories, a widely-known prior license would protect the author from a claim of breach of contract, even in the absence of an addendum. This is one more reason to publicize the university's OA policy.

Also see the entry below on working with publishers. (See p. 29)

5. MULTIPLE DEPOSITS

If a faculty member deposits a paper in a non-institutional reposi-tory (e.g. arXiv, PubMed Central, SSRN), the institutional repository should harvest a copy.

To avoid diluting the traffic numbers at the several repositories, all should comply with the (evolving) PIRUS[39] standards for sharing traffic data.

If a faculty member is subject to two OA policies (e.g. one from the university and one from the funder), the university should offer to make the deposit required by the funder.

- For example, most faculty at Harvard Medical School are subject to the NIH policy. If they deposit in the HMS repository, then HMS will insure that a copy is deposited in PubMed Central. If faculty think that an institutional policy will double their administrative burden, they will vote against it.

6. DARK DEPOSITS

Faculty should always deposit suitable versions (See p. 7) of new scholarly articles in the institutional repository. If they obtain a waiver for a given article, then the deposit will at least initially be "dark" (or non-OA). But the author should still deposit the manuscript.

- One reason for repositories to allow dark deposits is to support the message that faculty should always deposit their new work.

If a deposit is dark, at least the metadata should be OA.

- Another reason to allow dark deposits is to facilitate search indexing and discovery for work which, for one reason or another, cannot yet be made OA.

If a deposit is only intended to be dark temporarily, for a known embargo period, then dark deposits should be set to open up automatically at the future date determined by the author decision or embargo period. Most repository software today supports this option.

If an author deposited a manuscript and obtained a waiver, then the institution does not have permission under the policy to make

that manuscript OA. At least initially, that deposits must be dark. However, the repository may switch the manuscript to OA if it can obtain permission from another source, such as a standing policy of the publisher's to allow OA after a certain embargo period. See the entry on waiver options. Repositories should make dark deposits OA whenever they are legally allowed to do so.

For seven reasons why repositories should allow dark deposits, see Stuart Shieber, The importance of dark deposit,[40] *The Occasional Pamphlet,* March 12, 2011.

7. DEPOSITED VERSIONS

Some authors will deposit the published version of an article instead of the final version of the author's peer-reviewed manuscript. (See p. 12)

- Some will mistakenly believe it is the version the policy asks them to deposit. Some will simply prefer it and demand to make it the OA version.

- Unless the publisher consents to the open distribution of the published version,[41] then ask the author for the final version of the author's peer-reviewed manuscript. If the author can't find the right version or insists on depositing the published edition, make it a dark deposit and open it up if and when the repository can obtain permission to make it OA.

8. INTERNAL USE OF DEPOSITED VERSIONS

When the institution reviews faculty publications for promotion, tenure, or internal funding, it should limit its review of research articles to those on deposit in the institutional repository.

- See Recommendation 1.6 from the BOAI-10 statement[42] (September 2012): "Universities with institutional repositories should require deposit in the repository for all research articles to be considered for promotion, tenure, or other forms of internal assessment and review....[This policy should not] be construed to limit the review of other sorts of evidence, or to alter the standards of review."

- Also see the Alhambra Declaration on Open Access[43] (May 2010): Universities should "consider[] repository-deposited material for evaluation processes and research assessment."

Versions of this policy have been adopted at the University of Liege, Edinburgh Napier University, the University of Oregon Department of Romance Languages, the Catholic University of Louvain, China's National Science Library, the Chinese Academy of Sciences, India's International Center for Tropical Agriculture, Canada's Institute for Research in Construction, the University of Salford, and the University of Luxembourg.

When properly written and implemented, these policies would not alter the kinds of evidence that committees are willing to consider, and would not alter the standards they use in awarding promotion, tenure, or internal funding themselves.

Institutions not ready to change their process for promotion and tenure could change the form[44] by which faculty apply for promotion and tenure and list their publications. The new form could simply add fields for the URLs of OA editions of the faculty member's research articles.

9. ASSOCIATING ARTICLES WITH THEIR DEFINITIVE VERSIONS

The author manuscript deposited in the repository is typically not identical (See p. 6) to the definitive published version, and its provenance should be made clear. This can and should be done in at least two ways.

First, each deposited article should be associated with the full citation for the published article. This may be done in a free text citation metadata field using any suitable citation style, or the equivalent information may be made available through a set of metadata fields providing journal name, volume, number, pages, etc.

Second, it is a good idea to provide links from the repository to the online definitive version of the deposited article where available. For example, Harvard provides links to definitive versions...

1. on search results pages associated with each search result,

2. on item metadata pages, and

3. on a cover page added to the front of the deposited PDF of the article.

10. REPOSITORY INDEXING

The repository should be configured to support crawling by search engines.

- See for example the JISC InfoNet recommendations[45] and Google Webmaster Guidelines.[46]

Repository managers should check to see whether the contents are discoverable through major search engines, and follow up any indexing failures.

11. REPOSITORY WITHDRAWALS

If a publisher sends a reasonable take-down request to the repository, the repository should always comply.

If the author wishes to withdraw an article already on deposit (e.g. because it is mistaken, embarrassing, superseded by a newer version, etc.), then the repository should withdraw the article. The author can always obtain a waiver, and then the university would no longer have the rights to distribute it. That's a reason why repositories should always follow author wishes on distribution. In any case, experience suggests that authors rarely ask to withdraw their own articles.

12. CONTENT BEYOND THE POLICY

The institution should welcome the deposit of types of scholarly content, above and beyond the type covered by the policy. For example, if the policy focuses on peer-reviewed manuscripts of journal articles, the repository should welcome deposit of other categories of scholarship as well, such as electronic theses and dissertations, books or book chapters, datasets, and digitized work from other media for which it has permission to provide OA. If the policy covers peer-reviewed manuscripts published after a certain date, it should welcome the deposit of peer-reviewed manuscripts completed or published before that date.

Even if the policy only gives the institution permission to make faculty work OA, the repository can and should welcome deposits from scholars at the institution who are not faculty.

Even if the policy only gives the institution permission to make certain kinds of content OA, the repository can and should welcome dark deposits where it doesn't have permission for OA, and in those cases it should provide OA to the metadata.

13. TREATIES WITH PUBLISHERS

Some publishers may concur with the policy so long as certain aspects are clarified concerning how the policy will be implemented. Providing such clarifications may be entirely reasonable, given that the policy language itself can't possibly cover all aspects of its implementation. For example, publishers may want to be sure that for manuscripts published in their journals the repository entry will include a complete citation and link to the published edition, or that the university will not distribute the publisher's version of the article, or that the license will not be used to sell articles. (See p. 21) If the institution is comfortable with these clarifications (indeed, the clarifications in the treaty may well be aspects of implementation to which the university is already committed), it may make these explicit in return for an explicit statement of the publisher's cooperation with the policy, for instance, by not requiring waivers or addenda to publication agreements. These agreements may contain any provisions consistent with the policy and agreeable to both sides. (At Harvard they are called "treaties".)

We strongly recommend against treaties requiring universities to respect a given embargo period for all articles from a given journal or publisher. Such a treaty would essentially give the journal or publisher a blanket opt-out of a significant provision of the university OA policy, and violate the express interest of the faculty in adopting a policy to shift the default to immediate OA.

- However, when authors rather than publishers seek an embargo, and seek it case by case rather than for all articles from a certain journal or publisher, the policy can accommodate them. See the entry on embargo options. (See p. 14)

Here's [an example of treaty language](#)[47] used at Harvard.

14. LEARNING THE DENOMINATOR

An institution can easily tell how many articles are on deposit in its repository. But it cannot easily tell how many articles ought to be on deposit. If it wants to calculate the deposit rate (the number

deposited divided by the number that ought to be deposited), then it must determine the denominator. This is a critical piece of information in measuring the effectiveness of the policy and its implementation.

Some institutions ask faculty to submit an annual list of their publications. If so, the information should be shared with the repository managers. The raw list of publications is less helpful than one broken down by categories, such as books, journal articles, and so on. If the policy only covers journal articles (for example), then the relevant denominator is the number of journal articles.

15. WORKING WITH PUBLISHERS

See the entry on author addenda. (See p. 23) A well-written author addendum can explain to publishers what rights the author has already assigned to the institution. Hence it can prevent authors from signing publishing contracts they cannot fulfill and prevent misunderstandings on all sides. However there are other ways to achieve some of the same goals.

Publishers who normally require the transfer of exclusive rights, but who do not demand waivers from authors at your institution, can modify their publishing contracts to facilitate cooperation with the institution. For example, it would help both sides if publishers included a sentence like this one from the Science Commons addendum[48]: "Where applicable, Publisher acknowledges that Author's assignment of copyright or Author's grant of exclusive rights in the Publication Agreement is subject to Author's prior grant of a non-exclusive copyright license to Author's employing institution and/or to a funding entity that financially supported the research reflected in the Article as part of an agreement between Author or Author's employing institution and such funding entity, such as an agency of the United States government."

- Such a clause would make addenda unnecessary for authors and publishers, and cost the publisher nothing.

16. TRACKING USAGE STORIES

MIT pioneered a technique for tracking stories about how articles they provide from their repository are being used. Harvard and perhaps others have copied the technique as well. The technique is

to inject an extra page at the front of the PDF of a distributed article (which the repository may already be doing to provide citation and licensing information), which provides a statement requesting information about how the article was used with a link to a web form to provide the statement. The MIT language is:

- The MIT Faculty has made this article openly available. [Please share](#)[49] how this access benefits you. Your story matters.

The stories can then be compiled and shared. For example, see the stories from [MIT](#)[50] and [Harvard](#)[51].

In the web form, you may want to request information about the article's user as well as the identity of the article itself (or this latter can be automatically provided in the link, as in the Harvard implementation). However, all of this information should be supplied only optionally.

Filling the repository

CONTENTS

Adopting an OA policy is easier than implementing one, and the hardest part of implementing a "green" or repository-based policy is to insure the deposit of all the work that ought to be deposited. This section covers incentives for authors to deposit their work themselves, as well as other methods, human and machine, for getting their work into the repository. It could be considered a subsection within the section on Implementing a policy. (See p. 21)But because it's large and still growing, we're making it a section to itself.

1. ADVOCACY AND EDUCATION

An institution can reach out to their community through a variety of methods to educate and inform their audience of reasons for and benefits of deposit, and the mechanics of the deposit process, to generate interest and alleviate concerns and impediments to deposit. Examples follow:

- Stellenbosch University[52] is auditing[53] SUNScholar[54] to ensure that it is reliable and authoritative. Included in the

audit is a scan of the IR's "Generally Accepted Repository Practice," which details the promotion efforts for the IR, including a help guide <http://brk.mn/7k>, social media outreach efforts, and more. See details here.[55]

- The Queensland University of Technology[56] (QUT) suggests working with influential faculty to gain "early adopters" of the institutional repository, for example, "late-career academics" and "high-status researchers," who could then serve as advocates for deposit. QUT also recommends partnering with department and school administrators by offering on-site training and providing details on participation and download rates by department/school; see details here.[57]

- Columbia University's[58] efforts to encourage faculty participation in the repository begin with robust outreach, which includes going to new student orientations, attending department meetings, and offering workshops. Rebecca Kennison notes that being visible and tailoring the message to the audience is critical; listen to details here.[59]

- Massey University[60] offers an "Introduction to eResearcher" presentation to faculty, which includes a description of what eResearcher is and how it works; details may be found here.[61]

- In 2006 the University of Southern Queensland[62] developed a marketing plan for their repository, which included actions aimed at specific audiences to "[i]Increase awareness and knowledge" of the repository and open access efforts to "increase confidence of academic and general staff in submission processes"; see details of the plan here.[63]

- Findings from a case study of the University of Illinois[64], University of Massachusetts[65], University of Michigan[66], University of Minnesota[67], and Ohio State University[68] indicated that "convincing key faculty to contribute" to the institution's repository is a fruitful "means of bringing others along". See details here.[69]

- A survey of content recruitment strategies found that 5 of 7 institutions studied used "promotional activities," including workshops, presentations, informational brochures, and websites to inform their constituents about the "submission procedure" and "benefits that are involved when making your thesis available online". The seven institutions surveyed were Boston College[70], University of Hong Kong[71], Stellenbosch University[72], University of Helsinki[73], North Carolina State University[74], University of Manitoba[75], and Brigham Young University[76]. See details here[77].

- The Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas (CSIC)[78] launched an advocacy campaign for OA Week 2012 that shares researcher stories about why they deposit their work into the IR. See details here[79]. CSIC also publishes a newsletter that shares internal strategies for filling the repository. See details here[80], but note the newsletter is only available in Spanish. Last, CSIC strengthened the institution's "training and awareness" program, details of which may be found here[81].

- JISC provides a Research Information Management infoKit[82] and Digital Repository infoKit[83], the latter of which provides "a practical 'how to' guide to setting up and running digital repositories." A section within the "Management Framework" discussion reviews methods for institutional change, which offers practical tips on advocacy[84], culture change[85], crafting a core message[86], advocacy options[87], and advocacy activities[88]. Some of these methods are illustrated with examples of activities taken by particular institutions. See details here[89].

- A University College London[90] study explores policies on, practices surrounding, and "barriers to the electronic deposit of e-theses" in the United Kingdom. Several of the identified concerns could be alleviated with education. See details here[91].

- The Queensland University of Technology (QUT)[92] uses targeted outreach efforts, including workshops with discipline-specific messages, and library liaisons participate heavily in the education and outreach process. See details here[93].

- A Confederation of Open Access Repositories (COAR)[94] report on "sustainable, replicable best practices related to populating repositories" includes advocacy efforts undertaken by the Digital Repository Federation (DRF)[95] in Japan, including building relationships, "always [being] visible," and creating a tailored message (find the full report here)[96]; and the Universität Konstanz[97], which relies heavily on building personal connections to both recruit content and develop allegiances (find more information here)[98]. See details here[99].

- Four case study sketches[100] explore the advocacy efforts of the University of Zimbabwe[101], Kamuzu College of Nursing[102], the University of Latvia[103], and the University of Khartoum[104]. See details here[105].

- The University of Exeter's[106] detailed advocacy plan aims to reach to encourage use of RePosit. Methods are tailored to the different audiences, and social media is used "as much as possible" because it is quick, easy, and has a wide reach. See details here[107].

- The [University of Minho][108] has established a four-tiered program to increase "the levels of adoption of the repository," which includes a promotional plan of activities, such as, "evangelis[ing] within our faculty...by means of presentations, papers, interviews, news in the press, promotional materials, flyers, websites." See details [here][109].

- The [Kultivate][110] project works "to increase the rate of arts research deposit." As such, it has developed a [toolkit][111] to support repository managers and staff in the development of an advocacy plan to encourage deposit of visual arts researchers. See details [here][112].

- Central to the [University of Central Lancashire's][113] IR's launch was the partnership that was established with the research community at the outset to not only gather content for the repository, but "[embed] the Repository within the University strategic goals and operational workflows at a high level to ensure its sustainability through ongoing population by research, teaching and learning and other project output". The outreach for this partnership started early in the process and included continual representation of and engagement with the research community. See details [here][114].

- [ETH][115], [MIT][116], and the [University of Rochester][117] use outreach strategies such as "branding the programme and raising awareness of the issue(s)...making the IR attractive to potential depositors...reinforcing a positive attitude and encouraging conditions that make depositing work in an IR an attractive option...[and] seeking to establish two-way communication and the involvement of the target audience." See details [here][118].

- Following a library survey conducted at [University of Jyväskylä][119], which revealed that participating faculty had several common misconceptions about the deposit process, permissions, and the repository's function, the library aims to clarify the deposit process and the role of researchers therein. See details [here][120].

- The [Centre for Research Communications, University of Nottingham's][121] Bill Hubbard discusses author concerns about depositing their work in institutional repositories. Foremost is that peer-reviewed work is listed alongside grey literature, but there are also concerns about "infringing copyright and infringing embargo periods;...the paper not having been 'properly edited by the publisher'; not

knowing of a suitable repository; a concern about plagiarism or unknown reuse; then not knowing how to deposit material in a repository and not knowing what a repository was." In response, Hubbard notes that education and "continued, repetitive, hard slog advocacy of the basics" will ease these concerns. See details [here](122).

- A [University of Cambridge](123) and [University of Highlands and Islands](124) project aimed to increase deposits to, satisfaction in, and "institutionalisation" of the institutional repository with "a technical integration tool which connected the Virtual Research Environment (VRE) to the IR." Communication and relationship building are described as "vital" to the program's success, because "the focus had to remain on the institutionalisation of the IR." See details [here](125).

- The [University of Southampton](126) offers IR advocacy in many forms; the library "provide[s] training and guidance, including bespoke and one-to-one training, not just on the use of the repository but on topics such as OA in general, e-theses, bibliometrics, data management and current awareness." See details [here](127).

- Cameroon's [University of Buea](128) used a "start small…to ensure functionality and effectiveness" plan to gather content from the faculty: the IR was first populated with "postgraduate theses." Currently advocacy efforts are underway to ensure the larger university community supports deposits to the IR. See details [here](129).

- Following the initial implementation of the repository [Ktisis](130), the [Cyprus University of Technology's](131) library staff focused on its promotion, which included the "develop[ment of] information services…using help pages, user guides, flyers, etc." to address copyright concerns of researchers and help them "understand the benefits that the institutional repository can offer." See details [here](132).

- A study at [Oregon State University](133) surveyed Thomson Reuters' Journal Citation Reports and SHERPA RoMEO to determine whether "core journals in a discipline…allow[ed] pre- or post-print archiving in their copyright transfer agreements." With this list, library staff approached faculty with "scholarly communication issues such as author's rights and open access" as a means of opening the discussion to encourage deposit to the institutional repository. See details [here](134).

- De Montfort University Leicester (DMU)[135] "aimed to enhance and embed the DMU repository DORA within institutional processes and systems." Advocacy work, as a component of the EXPLORER project, involved a "targeted approach" that ran for the duration of the project, from events to blog posts and "advocacy materials," as well as demonstrations. See details here[136].

- The University of Glasgow's[137] created a Daedalus[138] project board that included faculty members, recruited OA-supportive faculty to submit early content, and offered presentations and other events to introduce the project to the community. See details here[139].

- The University of Rochester[140] created "a 'crib sheet' for librarians of responses to faculty questions and concerns about the IR". Other examples of IR promotional methods are detailed here[141].

- The (University of Illinois[142], University of Massachusetts[143], University of Michigan[144], University of Minnesota[145], and Ohio State University[146]) have varied "successful strategies" of securing content, one of which includes "convincing key faculty to contribute as a means of bringing along others." See details here[147].

- Rollins College's[148] library involved faculty in periodical reviews when canceling titles as a practical means of opening discussion on campus about scholarly communication; OA journals and repositories were then introduced as an alternative to the subscription model. The different stakeholders received different advocacy messages; for example, "the provost was interested in institutional reputation, the Dean of Faculty by the idea of a stable repository of faculty publications, IT and the librarians in a hosted solution...which did not involve much staff time and expertise [and]...the faculty...in more visibility for their own research and a policy that was flexible." See details here[149].

- The University of Glasgow[150] is working to embed their repository "into the fabric of the institution" over time. Included in these efforts are "Open Access advocacy activities" and "[r]unning training courses for departmental staff and administrators about Open Access, [the] Policy and Repository." See details here[151].

- Kalamazoo College's[152] institutional repository development has involved many constituents; these populations - library and IT staff, deans, faculty, and administrative assistants -

require outreach for success, including fostering "a sense of community ownership" and "buy in." See details [here](#)[153].

- A case study of three libraries and their approaches to filling their institutional repositories with content shows that all three institutions employed advocacy for the institutional repository to acquire content, from faculty outreach with library liaisons to instructional presentations and branding and marketing of the repository. See details [here](#)[154].

- The [University of Northampton](#)[155] is working to "modify university procedures for submission to NECTAR, increase researcher involvement, encourage the deposit of full content and further embed NECTAR in researcher workflows"; included in the university's plan to do so is to "provide a programme of appropriate training, advocacy and promotional activity." Several "presentations" and "training sessions" have been delivered. See details [here](#)[156].

- At the [California Institute of Technology](#)[157] encouraging deposit is a "sociological and strategic" endeavor. To be successful in recruiting researcher support, it has been important to work toward securing senior faculty as early adopters, who "may view the proposition [of deposit] as a capstone/culmination/collected works project for their career." By supporting this argument with data, a convincing position may be made that "content in the IR is highly visible and read." These identified "opinion leaders" can become fruitful partners in the deposit of work to the institutional repository. See details [here](#)[158].

- Outreach for the institutional repository at the [University of Southampton](#)[159] is strong, ranging from providing presentations and one-on-one support, to offering "Help and Information," and "engag[ing] people on all levels involved in the depositing process." See details [here](#)[160].

- An institutional repository liaison was hired at [Minho University](#)[161] to provide author support, which included outreach efforts such as introductory and "refresher" presentations, promotional materials, a help desk, and more. See details [here](#)[162].

- The [University of St Andrews'](#)[163] repository development has included strategies that have been used successfully to encourage deposit. Simply put, "Actual staff on the ground devoting substantial time to interaction with researchers is crucial." In addition to added services that are headed by librarians, "[p]romotion of the repository can raise aware-

ness amongst our academics of the issues around copyright and full text dissemination, and influence attitudes towards open access." See details [here](#)[164].

- Work from the [California Polytechnic State University](#)[165] offer "[b]asic marketing principles and how to apply them to marketing an institutional repository within a higher education setting." See details [here](#)[166]. Note: This is a toll-access work.

- The [Instituto Politécnico de Castelo Branco's](#)[167] institutional repository has implemented a "diffusion strategy," including conferences and newsletters, which is used to educate the community about the presence of the repository. See details [here](#)[168].

- The [Georgia State University](#)[169] has been working "to increase awareness about OA in general and provide practical information to GSU faculty about their 'copy rights.'" New faculty were targeted with an outreach campaign that included "Peter Suber's new book *Open Access* from MIT Press...a bookmark explaining OA; information on the university's institutional repository, the [Digital Archive @ GSU](#)[170]; and contact information for a subject specialist librarian in the faculty member's field." The marketing campaign also included "academic deans and other key administrators on campus" and has positively received. See details [here](#)[171].

- [Open University](#)[172] identifies advocacy and development as the cornerstones for building an institutional repository collection without a mandate. The advocacy methods have been varied, from using social media for promotional efforts to attending department meetings. The efforts have attracted "63% of the OU's journal output published in 2008 and 2009" and the repository managers are "getting around 36 full-text deposits per week, compared to a low of 2 per week before the advocacy/development campaign." See details [here](#)[173].

- The [University of Stellenbosch](#)[174] offers several suggestions for "internal" and "external" marketing efforts to garner support for an institution's repository. Included as examples are "presentations," "demonstrations," and "individual appointments" for marketing the repository and generating interest in deposit. See details [here](#)[175].

- An Open Access Week poster[176] from the London School of Economics and Political Science[177] clearly illustrates the value added from depositing in the LSE Research Online[178] institutional repository in several bullet points: high visibility, professional profiles with accurate and comprehensive content, and copyright compliance. These benefits serve as a counterpoint to common author practices for posting their work on "personal webpages." This simple advocacy tool highlights major talking points.

- The University of Glasgow[179] reports on the University's efforts "to create an Open Access Repositories Resource Pack (OARRPack) for the UK's Open Access Implementation Group (OAIG)," the end goal of which is "a mix of the high level information necessary to enact institution-wide policy changes and the practical details needed in order to implement these policy changes." OAIG's[180] research pack provides "Information and guidance"[181], which includes a section on advocacy and cultural change[182]. There are links to "Key resources"[183], tips for crafting "a clear message about why an institution's repository is important, and why people need to engage with it," and sample institutions that have led successful advocacy campaigns: the University of Liège[184], University of Southampton[185], and Queensland University of Technology[186]. Find a video[187] by William Nixon, of the University of Glasgow, on the resource pack. See details here[188].

- The Welsh Repository Network[189] offers several solutions to common challenges for repository deposits. Education is highlighted as important for generating buy-in to the institutional repository across many fronts: from gaining high-level support, which will create an "integration with other [university] systems and processes" and can lay the foundation for an institution-wide mandate, to building an understanding across the community of users of the benefits of depositing their work into the repository (e.g., a wider readership, public funding issues, author rights and copyright, etc.). See details here[190].

- Joanne Yeomans, of the CERN Library[191] staff introduces new staff to the deposit process and uses an internal bulletin to remind staff to deposit work. Future plans include following up with authors about specific works that have not yet been deposited. See details here[192].

2. AUTOMATED DEPOSIT TOOLS

Institutions can use automated deposit tools to increase the ease of participation in repository deposit. These tools help to streamline, automate, or standardize the deposit process to encourage participation. Examples follow.

1. BibApp[193] "matches researchers on your campus with their publication data and mines that data to see collaborations and to find experts in research areas." Find the press release announcing BibApp here[194]. Instances of BibApp may be found at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign[195], Marine Biological Library Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution Library[196], and University of Kansas Medical Center[197].

   » Hannover Medical School[198] uses tools such as BibApp, which "showcases the scholarly work done by a particular researcher, research group, department or institution" to motivate researchers to self-deposit. See details here[199].

   » In a 2009 survey of OpenDOAR[200]-registered institutional repositories that studied copyright clearance activities, BibApp is noted as a tool that can be used to "formaliz[e] permissions workflows." That BibApp "automatically checks citations for deposit policy in SHERPA/RoMEO" reduces the individual effort of authors and library staff in copyright clearance associated with deposit. See details here[201].

2. DepositMO[202] "seeks to embed a culture of repository deposit into the everyday work of researchers. The project extended the capabilities of repositories to exploit the familiar desktop and authoring environments of its users, specifically, to deposit content directly from Microsoft Word and Windows Explorer." See details here[203].

   » DepositMO was introduced at a "JISC Programme meeting" as a way to upload images to streamline the deposit process. See details here[204].

3. DepositMOre[205] is "working with selected repository partners to build and apply new discovery and deposit tools and to show statistically MOre deposits in these repositories," resulting from use of DepositMO tools.

4. [Deposit Strand](#)[206] aims "make it easier to deposit into repositories. The projects will identify and implement good practice and technical solutions that can be shared with other institutions, ultimately leading to better populated open access repositories with increased benefit to the researcher, the sector and the economy." See additional details of the deposit tools [here](#)[207].

5. [Direct User Repository Access (DURA)](#)[208] aims to "embed institutional deposit into the academic workflow of the researcher at almost no cost to the researcher." The proprietary ["upcoming Mendeley module"](#)[209] that resulted from the JISC-funded project's efforts works with Symplectic's [Elements](#)[210] software to allow researchers to "synchronise their personal Mendeley profiles with their Elements account at their institution; and most importantly, take advantage of the rich file sharing capabilities of Mendeley." See details [here](#)[211].

6. [EasyDeposit](#)[212] is an "open source [SWORD](#)[213] client creation toolkit. With EasyDeposit you can create customised SWORD deposit web interfaces from within your browser. You can choose the steps which the user is presented with, change their order, [and] edit the look and feel of the site so that it matches your institution."

    »   As a follow-on to the 2009 development of [EasyDeposit](#)[214], multiple-repository-deposit functionality has been added to this script. See details [here](#)[215].

    »   [EasyDeposit](#)[216] was born out of a need to have "a generic SWORD deposit interface toolkit that allowed new deposit systems to be easily created." Two examples from the [University of Auckland Library](#)[217] illustrate how Easy Deposit helps to make deposits easier for projects/constituents with specific, singular needs: Ph.D. candidates' thesis deposit and the archiving of a technical report series. See details [here](#)[218].

7. [Open Archives Initiative's Protocol for Metadata Harvesting (OAI-PMH)](#)[219] "provides an application-independent interoperability framework based on metadata harvesting." For details on the history and foundations of institutional repositories and the importance of standards to repository interoperability to enable the "harvesting, searching, depositing, authentication, and describing [of] contents," see [here](#)[220].

8. Open Access Repository Junction (OA-RJ)[221] is "an API that supports redirect and deposit of research outputs into multiple repositories."

9. Open Depot[222] "ensure[s] that all academics worldwide can share in the benefits of making their research output Open Access. For those whose universities and organisations have an online repository, OpenDepot.org makes them easy to find. For those without a local repository, including unaffilitiated researchers, the OpenDepot is a place of deposit, available for others to harvest."

10. Organisation and Repository Identification (ORI)[223] is "a standalone middleware tool for identifying academic organisations and associated repositories. This project will improve the ORI functionality developed for the Open Access Repository Junction (OA-RJ) and OpenDepot.org by EDINA and establish it as an independent middleware component made openly available for any third party application to use." See details here[224].

11. PUMA[225] aims to integrate deposit into an author's workflow as follows: "the upload of a publication results automatically in an update of both the personal and institutional home-page, the creation of an entry in BibSonomy[226], an entry in the academic reporting system of the university, and its publication in the institutional repository." See details here[227].

12. RePosit[228] "seeks to increase uptake of a web-based reposi-tory deposit tool embedded in a researcher-facing publica-tions management system." The project's blog[229] details the work of the group members, "University of Leeds (Chair)[230], Keele University[231], Queen Mary University of London[232], University of Exeter[233] and University of Plymouth[234], with Symplectic Ltd[235]."

   » A University of Cambridge[236] and University of Highlands and Islands[237] project aimed to increase deposits to, satisfaction in, and "institutionalisation" of the institutional repository with "a technical integration tool which connected the Virtual Research Environment (VRE) to the IR." The tool was success-fully developed and implemented, and deposits since have increased: "The number of IR communities has doubled and the number of collections has tripled." See details here[238].

13. [Repository Junction (RJ) Broker](#)[239] is "a standalone middleware tool for handling the deposit of research articles from a provider to multiple repositories." A June 2013 [project update](#)[240] notes that RJ Broker's trial with [Nature Publishing Group](#)[241] and [Europe PubMed Central](#)[242] is complete (and was successful), and the development and transition to RJ Broker as a service is underway. Additionally, MIT is "working on a data importer for DSpace." See details [here](#)[243].

14. [Simple Web-service Offering Repository Deposit (SWORD)](#)[244] "is a lightweight protocol for depositing content from one location to another." Find an introductory video on SWORD 2.0 [here](#)[245].

   » [BioMed Central](#)[246] briefly describes its partnership with [MIT](#)[247] "to set up an automatic feed of MIT articles...The SWORD protocol allows the institutional repository to receive newly published articles from any of BioMed Central's 200+ journals as soon as they are published, without the need for any effort on the part of the author and streamlining the deposit process for the repository administrator." See details [here](#)[248].

   » SWORD is identified in a [Confederation of Open Access Repositories (COAR)](#)[249] preliminary report on "replicable best practices related to populating repositories" as a "deposit mechanism [that] offers a unified ingestion service and guarantees a robust transfer of manuscripts." Included in this discussion are [PEER](#)[250]-created [guidelines](#)[251] on "deposit, assisted deposit and self-archiving" facilitated by SWORD. See details [here](#)[252].

   » The SWORD protocol is used to push the works from BioMed Central to [MIT's](#)[253] repository; this efficiency "make[s] it easier for our faculty to make their work openly available." See details [here](#)[254].

   » The SWORD protocol is flexible, enabling deposit to repositories from publishers, the researcher's desktop, and more. These "different use cases, how they fit into the scholarly lifecycle, and how SWORD facilitates them" are illustrated with examples. See details [here](#)[255].

   » SWORD has application in [arXiv](#)[256] deposits, including "ingest from various sources" and "deposit to [Data Conservancy](#)[257]". Because arXiv was an "early adopter" of SWORD, it has "> 5000 accepted submissions" from the protocol. See details [here](#)[258].

3. COPYRIGHT SUPPORT

An institution can provide copyright support to depositing authors, which may include services such as publisher negotiation, copyright education, and version control.

- A [Confederation of Open Access Repositories (COAR)](259) preliminary report on "sustainable, replicable best practices related to populating repositories" discusses the copyright clearance efforts of five institutions, including [Griffith University](260), to make deposit easier for authors. These activities range from advising authors to contacting publishers to secure clearance. See details [here](261).

- The [University of Minho](262) created "value-added services for both authors and readers," which included "help pages and user guides…to aid authors with the decision of whether or not they could publish their materials in Open Access IRs without infringing any previous copyright releases they may have already signed." See details [here](263).

- Results of a survey conducted at the [Cyprus University of Technology](264) revealed that forthcoming efforts should be made by the library to "[d]evelop [an] author addendum policy." See details [here](265).

- Copyright remains a particular concern for artists, and the [Visual Arts Data Service (VADS)](266) has "produced [guidelines and scenarios](267)…to 'allay fears, misconceptions and ignorance in respect of copyright and IPR'" with the aim to increase deposit through copyright education and support. See details [here](268).

- The [University of Southampton's](269) initiatives that aim to encourage deposit include the library providing "guidance on copyright" to researchers. See details [here](269) <http://brk.mn/7g>.

- A [London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine (LSHTM)](270) [Research Online](271) blog post indicates that "our team who are experienced in navigating open access publisher policies…will check all rights on your behalf and advise you as to what we can make freely available." See details [here](272).

- The [University of Glasgow](273) provides copyright support for authors by exploring permissions agreements and contacting publishers with licensing questions directly. See details [here](274).

- [Cornell University](275) is an institution that offers researcher assistance in "checking copyright permissions, negotiating

with publishers, [and] requesting final manuscript versions from faculty." See details [here](#)[276].

- The [University of Illinois](#)[277], [University of Massachusetts](#)[278], [University of Michigan](#)[279], [University of Minnesota](#)[280], and [Ohio State University](#)[281] have varied "successful strategies" of securing content for deposit, one of which included "negotiating with publishers to include faculty content." See details [here](#)[282].

- The [University of Glasgow's](#)[283] efforts to embed their repository "into the fabric of the institution" over time included the library's role in "[c]larifying and assisting researchers with © status of their publications [and] liaising with publishers." See details [here](#)[284].

- The [Oregon State University](#)[285] Library has partnered with the "OSU Advancement News and Communication" office to ensure that the works profiled by the News and Communication group have been deposited in the repository; a wider readership for the faculty member is thus secured and "the appropriate research article [is] deposited." See details [here](#)[286].

4. CUSTOMIZATION AND VALUE-ADDED TOOLS

An institution can create tools or offer services as add-ons to repository software that offer value to the depositing researcher. Examples follow:

- [Stellenbosch University](#)[287] is [auditing](#)[288] [SUNScholar](#)[289] to ensure that it is reliable and authoritative. Included in the audit is a scan of the IR's "Generally Accepted Repository Practice", which details the "[c]ustomisation of the repository is usually required to make it fit for the purpose it was created", including [theme](#)[290], [collections](#)[291], [submissions](#)[292], and [search](#)[293]. See details [here](#)[294].

- The [Queensland University of Technology](#)[295] offers a "researcher page," which publicizes an individual's research output in a customizable format. QUT also suggests that researchers "embed the URL into their email signature"; see details [here](#)[296].

- An active researcher at [Hannover Medical School](#)[297], Martin Fenner, created a list of motivators for self-deposit, which includes institutional repositories hosting "primary research data" and integrating the repository content with journal

submission. An example of such a tool that Fenner mentions is [eSciDoc](298), which "include[s] storing, manipulating, enriching, disseminating, and publishing not only of the final results of the research process, but of all intermediate steps as well." See details [here](299).

- The [University of Minho's](300) institutional repository "has been actively involved in the development of add-ons" for DSpace to improve its functionality. Examples of these add-ons are those that enable the sharing of statistics, "request[ing] a copy," a controlled vocabulary, commenting, and recommending. See details [here](301).

- In a case study of three anonymous libraries and their approaches to filling their institutional repositories with content, one of the institutions employs a "software specialist who leads repository design customizations and functionality enhancements," which are tailored to meet "the needs and interests of faculty." See details [here](302).

- The [Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas's](303) (CSIC's) efforts to populate its institutional repository include a near-term goal to create APIs that will enable publication lists from the institutional repository to be re-packaged "as annual-report-building-applications, author or departmental web pages or standardised CV formats". See details [here](304). Additional "improvements in the platform" are discussed in the CSIC's [annual report](305), including embargo functionality, bibliographic export capability, and social bookmarking features.

- The [University of Liege's](306) repository has been successful from efforts that "demonstrate to our authors that the system has actually been designed for their own benefit." For example, the repository "provides a single point of entry, but multiple output options, thereby allowing them to generate CVs and publication lists etc.; and it provides a tool to evaluate the quality of their research; and an efficient personal marketing tool." See details [here](307).

- Six institutional repositories were studied (including the [University of Minho](308), [University of Southampton](309), and [CERN](310)) to discover their methods to encourage author deposit. Several "services" are noted that add value for users in all six case studies; for example, automated publication lists, data storage, and RSS feeds were offered, depending on the needs of the local environment. A [table](311) illustrates the numerous value-added services that are provided. See details [here](312).

- [Cornell's](#)[313] [VIVO](#)[314] and the [University of Oxford's](#)[315] [BRII](#)[316] projects are noted examples of institutions with IRs that are "integrating them [repositories] into a much wider context of diverse information systems." See details [here](#)[317].

- The [University of Southampton](#)[318], [University of Stirling](#)[319], and the [University of Minho](#)[320] all provide "'Request-a-co-py'…'Email Eprint Request'…'Fair Dealing'…[or] 'Fair Use' Button[s]." EPrints and DSpace both have this functionality developed, which allows works that are either under embargo or restricted from OA distribution by publisher de-mand to still be deposited and shared in a limited fashion, so that "Researchers from all disciplines can be confident that the couple of clicks required to give a fellow research-er access to their Closed Access article is legal… and fair." See details [here](#)[321].

- The [Open University](#)[322] identifies development as one of the cornerstones for building an institutional repository collection without a mandate. The development methods were varied, ranging from creating "gatekeeper controlled groups" to offering embedded feeds. See details [here](#)[323].

- [Carnegie Mellon University](#)[324] conducted a study of their researchers, who indicated that providing added value from deposit in the repository was critical. Researchers would value "a service or benefit they earnestly want but don't currently have". Examples of such efforts that were raised in focus groups include the following: integrated systems, so that updates to personal/lab websites would update the repository; citation generators for end-of-year reporting; data and media deposit, along with supplemental materials; etc. See details [here](#)[325].

5. EASE OF USE

An institution can create systems or put workflows in place to make the deposit process easier for the author. Examples follow:

- The University of Iowa's [Iowa Research Online](#)[326] uses metadata crosswalks to "[repurpose] nonMARC metadata from ProQuest" to create new records in the repository, reducing redundancy of effort. See details [here](#)[327].

- A [presentation](#)[328] by [Georgia State University's](#)[329] Tammy Sugarman details how catalogers "provide quality control… select keywords…[and] create new metadata and input ma-

terials into the IR on a submitter's behalf," which benefits both the depositor and the end user. See details here[330].

- The Queensland University of Technology[331] suggests several options for "remov[ing] disincentives" for deposit; for example, converting native format files, reducing the number of mandatory fields, and checking publishers' deposit policies. See details here[332].

- Columbia University[333] encourages ease of participation in the repository by creating a one-time sign-off for proxy deposit. Once the researcher has signed this agreement, library staff check for new content from that author; listen to details here[334].

- The Glasgow School of Art's[335] repository, RADAR[336], was integrated with the university's website and now has an updated user interface. This new "system [is] based on usability, design, aesthetics and user needs" and has "Improved support for non-text deposits." See details here[337].

- The University for the Creative Arts[338] has developed a tool-kit[339] that "describes processes and workflows" surrounding the preparation for and deposit of works to the university's institutional repository. The files have been made available for reuse by other institutions. See details here[340].

- The Royal College of Art[341] has worked closely with a group of researchers to understand their workflow and needs to ensure that the "easy upload and curation of multiple documents and objects into repository records" was supported. A guide is in development for "collecting data, preparing files, clearing content for publication, [and the] deposit workflow." The case study[342] is available, and details may be found here[343].

- The University of Southampton[344] aims to encourage deposit by developing tools "to help researchers deposit such as import and export functions, XML, reference managers, DOI, and integration with other services such as PubMed and WOK." See details here[345].

- Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas[346] (CSIC) populates its institutional repository with an "OA strategy [that] aims mainly to increase the visibility of its research output." Informational sessions are delivered to each department, and deposits are "synchronized" in that metadata are pulled off of departmental websites and input to the repository by IT staff, leaving the researchers with the task

of simply uploading the work at the appropriate time. A proposed project is to couple the CSIC's repository with subject repositories so that authors need to deposit their paper to only one location, with interoperability ensuring that the work appears in all relevant repositories. See details [here](347).

- The [Texas Digital Library](348) created an open source electronic thesis and dissertation management system, [Vireo](349), that offers an simple interface for students to submit their completed theses and dissertations. Partial funding for the project was made available through an [Institute of Museum and Library Services](350) grant. See details [here](351).

6. EMBEDDING

An institution can encourage deposit by folding the repository into the reporting processes and workflows, making deposit a routine practice. Examples follow:

- Tyler Walters, of [Virginia Tech](352), notes that by "automatically captur[ing] metadata as defined by the data producers and provid[ing] ways for researchers to mark up their data," institutional repositories "are increasingly being designed to support research groups 'from beginning to end.'" Additionally, "toolkits designed to support different ways to view and work with data…, support collaboration and communication by research teams, and provide general tools to support working groups" have embedded repositories into research "ecosystems". See details [here](353).

- The [University of Southampton](354) has worked to integrate the IR "into research management systems, which combine publications data with profiles of grant income, research income, and citation metrics…[which] are being used to support REF." See details [here](355).

- The [University of Glasgow](356) aims to "develop a workflow which would enable us to add content systematically on a University-wide basis." This idea is borne out of the publication gathering that is undertaken for the Research Assessment Exercise; a seamless process could be established in which "each faculty or department would create and maintain a locally held publications database," from which the repository could then pull content. See details [here](357).

- Six participants of the "JISC Repositories: take-up and embedding" (JISCrte) project[358] discuss the challenges of embedding repositories, which include "the variety of ways advocating and marketing for the institutional repository; the difficulties met with the technical skills and reaching the PVC agenda; and, the importance of MePrints and the practice of embedding repositories." The program's presentations[359] are available, as are project reports from the eight institutions: De Montfort University[360], University of Hull[361], Glasgow School of Art, Middlesex University[362], University of Northampton[363], Visual Arts Data Service[364], University of the Creative Arts[365], and University of the Arts London[366]. See details here[367].

- The "PURE[368] implementations at the Universities of St Andrews[369] and Aberdeen[370] are designed to access their institutional repositories for full-text data," and the "University of York[371] is also currently implementing PURE, which will be integrated with their existing publications and multimedia repositories." These institutions are integrating their repositories and Current Research Information Systems, so metadata and full text of research outputs are seamlessly shared. See details here[372].

- The University of Aberdeen[373], Northampton University[374], and University of Dundee[375] undertook efforts to embed their IRs. See details here[376], and a self-assessment tool here.[377]

7. FUNDING ALLOCATION

An institution can make internal funding depend on deposit in the repository. Funds can be distributed to individual researchers or to a collective unit (e.g., lab, department, school).

- When the Universidad Carlos III de Madrid[378] evaluates internal funding requests from department and institute applicants, the university takes into account the commitment of the department/institute to deposit their researchers' work in the IR. See details here[379].

- Since 2005[380] the University of Minho[381] has used a system that employs a tiered scoring structure to award money to departments based on their faculty body's "commitment in the implementation of the [self-archiving] policy." Points are awarded to each document based on type and date of publication. See here[382] and here[383] for details.

- [Oslo University College](#)[384] uses a weighted system to award internal research funding to individual researchers: those who deposit their work to the repository receive full credit, whereas those who do not receive half-credit; these points are then used to determine funding distribution. See [here](#)[385] for details.

8. INTERNAL USE

When the institution makes decisions on promotion and tenure, or internal funding for faculty members, and asks applicants to list their publications, then it might limit its consideration of research articles to those on deposit in the institutional repository. Examples follow:

- The [University of Minho](#)[386] requires that internal reporting of research output must link to the full-text version of the work in the IR; this follows directly from the University's strategic plan. The University uses Scopus and Web of Science to monitor author compliance with the institution's policy. See details [here](#)[387].

- The [University of Zurich](#)[388] "only [includes] publications registered in the repository" in annual reporting. See details [here](#)[389].

- Canada's [National Research Council's Institute for Research in Construction](#)[390] review committee uses "only official bibliographies generated from the NRC-IRC Publications Database" when considering the promotion of their researchers. See details [here](#)[391]; note this is a toll-access article.

- The [University of Liege](#)[392] has a policy that only deposited works are factors in "decisions about promoting a researcher, or awarding a grant" and "only those references introduced in ORBi [Open Repository & Bibliography] will be taken into consideration as the official list of publications accompanying any curriculum vitæ in all evaluation procedures." See details [here](#)[393] and [here](#)[394].

- Also see our [recommendation on this point](#)[395] in the [implementation section](#)[396] of the guide.

9. METRICS

An institution can provide metrics as a value-added feature of the repository. These metrics can be publicly available or accessible only to the author, and can include download and view counts, among others. Examples follow:

- The University of Bristol[397] developed ResearchRevealed[398], a tool that "provides researchers and academic support staff with integrated views over publications, people, departments, groups, grants and both internally and externally obtained funding data…[and] allows academics to quickly capture evidence of their own research impact from external websites, recording this alongside their traditional research outputs data." The project was funded by JISC[399], and details may be found here[400].

- The University of Michigan[401]-hosted ICPSR[402] data repository provides detailed use statistics for each item by unique session (detailing whether just the data, just the documentation, or the data and documentation were downloaded), user (identified by type; i.e., faculty, student, staff, etc.), and downloading institutional member. See comments here[403].

- The Queensland University of Technology[404] provides download statistics to their researchers; see details here[405].

- Columbia University <http://brk.mn/7h> encourages participation in the repository by sending faculty monthly statistics on their work that is available in the IR. The figures include COUNTER-compliant downloads from the previous month and cumulative downloads; listen to details here[406].

- Kyushu University[407] provides citation counts and download numbers for researchers. In addition, the university developed a "researcher database" that is linked with a nuanced feedback system that "analyze[s] co-occurrence on the accesses of the same reader" in usage metrics, which are available to each researcher with authentication. See details here[408].

- The University of Rochester's[409] IR+ provides usage statistics, which are valuable to researchers because "counts provide quantifiable evidence, and [are] a simple and effective way to show how the repository is providing a valuable outlet for their work." See details here[410].

- The Queensland University of Technology's (QUT's)[411] IR supports a statistics feature, which "allows authors to monitor how many times each of their deposited papers is either viewed or downloaded." See details here[412].

- The University of St Andrews[413] provides IR usage statistics. A blog posting[414] by the university's Jackie Proven introduces the details of the page views and download statistics, along with the most viewed works by collection. See details here[415].

- The Murdoch University[416] repository <http://brk.mn/7j> uses "access statistics…to create a competitive incentive for submission." See details here[417].

- The University of Minho[418] offers "value-added services for both authors and readers," which include giving research-ers the ability "to check various types of useful statistics about their communities and their deposited information items." The range of statistics include "how many times their deposited items had been downloaded…the countries from which those downloads originated and…how many people read the metadata for the items but had not downloaded the items themselves," and more. See details here[419], and additional details here[420].

- The University of Southampton[421] provides an "integrated statistics service" because "[a]uthors are often keen to know how many people have been accessing their work." See details here[422].

- De Montfort University Leicester (DMU)[423] implemented "[u]pgrades to DSpace allowing for display of statistics on all items." See details here[424].

- The University of California[425] provides usage information in eScholarship. See details here[426].

- In an effort to populate its IR, the Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas[427] (CSIC) has added "a complete module of statistics…[that lets] the authors measure the effects of depositing their work in Digital.CSIC[428] on its visibility." See details here[429], and additional details here[430].

- The University of Southampton[431] encourages author deposit to the institutional repository by providing "usage statistics…to research groups and individuals demonstrating research impact." See details here[432].

- Arthur Sale, of the University of Tasmania[433], discusses citation metrics as a successful means of advocating for deposit. He mentions Anne-Will Harzing's Publish or Perish[434] tool as a way to illustrate "how online access… can be used to develop sophisticated metrics of research impact." These metrics may be used to "deliver a research record summary" for each researcher, which may be used in performance evaluation (though Sale cautions against using institutional repository metrics for promotion). See details here[435].

- Butler University[436] uses download metrics, which provide immediate feedback to authors (and deans) on usage, and efforts of the University of Wollongong[437] include "activity reports for every participating department [which include] number of items uploaded to the repository, number of downloads, most active authors, and 'fun facts.'" These reports offer authors "a sense of competition and accomplishment," and deans a measure of their department's output, which can aid in promotion decisions. See details here[438].

- The University of Manchester[439] is making view and citation metrics available to researchers (requiring authentication), and will begin offering "usage and deposit data as appropriate on public-facing web pages." See details here[440].

10. PERSONALIZATION

An institution can create a customizable web presence to feature researchers and their work in the IR. These efforts can potentially create a sense of personalization and community within the broader context of an institutional repository. Examples follow:

- Columbia University[441] encourages participation in the repository by creating an individual bit.ly for each faculty member's collection in the repository, which the researcher can then use on grant applications, CVs, and posters; listen to details here[442].

- Findings from a case study of the University of Illinois[443], University of Massachusetts[444], University of Michigan[445], University of Minnesota[446], and Ohio State University[447] indicated that "the development of faculty homepages... are quite popular" for increasing deposit participation. See details here[448].

- The use of tools that "unambiguously connect [content] to their creators", such as Open Researcher & Contributor ID[449] (ORCID), are listed as motivators for self-deposit from an active researcher at Hannover Medical School[450]. See details here[451].

- The Royal College of Art[452] uses MePrints[453], which "provides an editable profile as the user's first point of entry." See details here[454] and here[455].

- China Agricultural University's[456] IR offers "integrated information of individual faculty and staff members, showing an

introduction to the individual, media coverage, published books and papers, theses and dissertations of graduate students, teaching activities, research projects and achievements, patents, etc." See details here[457].

- The NARCIS[458] collaborative project in the Netherlands and the University of Rochester[459] are two examples of institutions that "[to] attract researchers...have built researcher bibliographies on top of IR platform, as an alternative access point." See details here[460].

- The University of Illinois[461], University of Massachusetts[462], University of Michigan[463], University of Minnesota[464], and Ohio State University[465] have varied "successful strategies" of securing content, one of is "the development of faculty homepages which are quite popular." See details here[466].

- The University of Glasgow[467] works to embed the repository "into the fabric of the institution". Included in these efforts is the "feeding institutional research profile pages" and "[m]anaging author disambiguation." See details here[468].

- University of Nebraska-Lincoln[469] has added collections of archival material from emeritus professors to the University's IR; for example, a former biological sciences professor, Paul Johnsgard, offered several articles and books for digitization. See details here[470].

- Arthur Sale, of the University of Tasmania[471], suggests including a means for researchers to link to an up-to-date and comprehensive list of their deposited papers on their personal website, and provides an example[472] of his own work. See details here[473].

- The University of Rochester's[474] IR+ includes "contributor pages," which display "statistics...download counts...[and] the most popular work" and give faculty members the ability to "add and remove files and correct metadata". The University also added a "user workspace" that gives researchers "their own web-based file system" to "download-modify-upload" and share works in progress, as well as a "portfolio page" that "gives users control over the presentation of their work." See details here[475], and additional resources here[476] and here[477].

11. PROXY DEPOSIT OR HARVESTING

An institution can implement complementary methods for gathering content for the repository, in addition to author deposits. These methods can include hiring student workers and dedicating staff time to depositing work on the behalf of authors, partnering with publishers to ingest institutional content into the IR, and pulling content from author websites. Examples follow:

- Stellenbosch University[478] is auditing[479] SUNScholar[480] to ensure that it is reliable and authoritative. Included in the audit is a scan of the IR's "Generally Accepted Repository Practice," which details the automatic[481] and manual[482] methods for ingesting work into SUNScholar. See details here[483].

- The Regional Universities Building Research Infrastructure Collaboratively (RUBRIC)[484] project developed "a collection of Python scripts and xsl transformations that enable data migration from various data sources to institutional repositories"; see details of this migration toolkit here[485].

- Columbia University[486] encourages participation in the repository by providing a CV review service for faculty: library staff review publications from an author's CV and then contact the faculty member for files that may be deposited to the repository; listen to details here[487].

- The College of Wooster[488] has developed a script[489] "that will automate PDF permissions lookup in Sherpa Romeo," which enables the user to easily determine whether a publisher's PDF of a work may be downloaded and deposited to an IR. The script is available for download here[490].

- Findings from a case study of the University of Illinois[491], University of Massachusetts[492], University of Michigan[493], University of Minnesota[494], and Ohio State University[495] indicated that "negotiating with publishers to include faculty content" in the institution's IR is a successful way to recruit content. See details here[496].

- The Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas[497] (CSIC) provides a "Mediated Archiving Service" to their faculty by which the library deposits work on behalf of researchers. See details here[498].

- The Australian National University[499] offers a discussion of harvesting work for local deposit. See details here[500] and here[501].

- MIT[502] efforts to increase content in their IR follow a "12-point strategy," including the use of "automated ingest tools" and "'scrap[ing]' the MIT domain to see what other papers they find within their institutional domain." See details here[503].

- MIT[504] also partners with BioMed Central[505] to harvest "the final published version" of researcher works. The SWORD protocol is used to push the works from BioMed Central to MIT's repository. See details here[506] and details on the Institute's extended publisher partnerships here[507].

- The University of Tromsø's[508] library harvests work for the repository by reviewing publications reports and consulting DOAJ and SHERPA/RoMEO to determine whether a work may be deposited. See details here[509].

- Harvard[510] employs students as Open Access Fellows[511] to "help faculty to make deposits into DASH, answer questions about the Open Access Policies, and help depositors complete metadata descriptions". See details here[512].

- Canada's National Research Council's Institute for Research in Construction's[513] library serves as a "technical and administrative" manager of the deposit of works to the repository. As such, the "staff enters all bibliographic information, creates standardized PDFs for the Web, 'alerts' clients to new material available and verifies that new publications are indexed by Internet search engines." See details here[514]. Note: This is a toll-access article.

- The Cyprus University of Technology's[515] Ktisis <http://bit.ly/UPnaD> repository offers "two existing available methods for submitting an item...either by sending the work by email or [by] using the self-archiving method." See details here[516].

- The London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine (LSHTM)[517] Research Online[518] repository "automatically imports records for all current LSHTM staff research which is published [and]...If an article is from an open access journal or...[is paid] open access....the publisher's full text PDF of the article" will be ingested. See details here[519].

- The University of Glasgow's[520] Daedalus[521] project team has used different methods for harvesting work: they have contacted faculty who post their work on their personal websites, asking permission to collect this work for the repository; pulled work from PubMed Central and requested deposit permission from the author; and searched journals

that grant deposit permission for Glasgow-authored works, whom they then approached to confirm whether the author would grant deposit. See details [here](#)[522].

- The [University of Edinburgh's](#)[523] library deposits work for the university's authors, when requested; and the [University of Glasgow](#)[524] actively collects content, both from "faculty and departmental websites" and "publishers that allow self-archiving." See details [here](#)[525].

- In a case study of three anonymous libraries and their approaches to filling their institutional repositories with content, one of the profiled institutions "brokered arrangements directly with publishers to acquire copyrighted, peer-reviewed journal papers written by their faculty" and "coordinated with departments for bulk ingests." See details [here](#)[526].

- The [California Institute of Technology](#)[527] harvests "low-hanging fruit" for the repository, which includes "the intellectual heritage...from the material which presents the least difficulties with respect to publisher permissions" and "[o]ther rich sources of readily available content includ[ing]...technical report series, working paper collections, theses, and dissertations." See details [here](#)[528].

- At [Southampton University](#)[529] deposit efforts are varied because the institutional repository is distributed across the university's different schools. One method that is used is for departments to appoint administrators to deposit works for authors. See details [here](#)[530].

- [CERN's](#)[531] high deposit rate can be attributed to several factors, including the following: "Departments are responsible for depositing content into the system mainly on behalf of its authors" and "Content not deposited by CERN researchers is harvested by the library." See details [here](#)[532].

- The [University of St Andrews](#)[533] repository uses a new "Current Research Information System (CRIS)," which works together with the repository. With the CRIS, "the library can monitor the research outputs added to Pure as researchers update their publication lists, contacting people who are engaging with the system." See details [here](#)[534] and information the University's work on the similar, but now-defunct, MERIT project [here](#)[535].

- The [William & Mary Law School](#)[536] repository, at its inception, was filled by "a small army of student assistants...[who

added] almost 5,000 documents…in the first six months of the repository's existence." See details [here][537].

- The [Texas Digital Library][538] created an open source electronic thesis and dissertation management system, [Vireo][539], providing "an expert management interface that lets graduate offices and libraries move the ETD through the approval workflow and publish it in an institutional repository" once a student has submitted it for approval. See details [here][540], and instillations of Vireo at [Texas A&M][541], [Texas Tech][542], and [the University of Texas at Austin][543].

- [Carnegie Mellon University][544] may be exploring a change to its the annual publications reporting system, that is, by requiring authors to include metadata and a copy of the final version of their work with each publication that would allow for harvest by library staff. See details [here][545].

- The [Botswana College of Agriculture (BCA)][546] library staff undertake efforts of "content harvesting, digitization of print materials, and the creation of metadata," which populate the repository. [Note: BCA's institutional repository is not publicly released yet; currently it is being used as an internal resource, which will presumably change once the "development" stage is complete.] See details [here][547].

- Repositories from the [University of Melbourne][548], [University of Queensland][549], [Queensland University of Technology][550], [University of Southampton][551], [University of Strathclyde][552], [University of Glasgow][553], and [Lund University][554] were studied, and rather than "disciplinary culture" being a strong indicator of deposit rate, an institutional mandate and a strong liaison program, which offers deposit support, is "an efficient and effective practice that is capable of making the content size of an IR larger." See details [here][555].

- [CERN's Library][556] "believes it retrieves bibliographic records for almost 100% of CERN's own documents." The high rate of full-text articles in CDS is attributable to a long-standing policy and digitization efforts by the library staff; additionally, CERN has permission from the American Physical Society to upload CERN-authored content to the CDS. See details [here][557].

Talking about a policy

CONTENTS

1. ACADEMIC FREEDOM

Some faculty object that a draft OA policy infringes their academic freedom.

- If they object that it will limit their freedom to submit new work to the journals of their choice, then they are mistaking a green policy (as recommended here) for a gold policy. They are mistaking deposit in OA repositories for submission to OA journals. Help faculty understand the difference between requiring deposit in a certain kind of repository and requiring submission to a certain kind of journal, and help them understand that the policy is limited to the former and does not extend to the latter.

- If they object that some journals will not allow OA on the university's terms, and that faculty will be effectively barred from publishing in those journals, then they are forgetting about the waiver option (if the policy has a waiver option, as recommended here). Faculty may submit their work to such a journal; if it is accepted, faculty may publish in that journal simply by obtaining a waiver, which the university will always grant, no questions asked. In fact, allowing this is the primary rationale for including the waiver option in the policy. Be explicit in reassuring faculty that they remain free to submit work to the journals of their choice and remain free to decide for or against OA for each of their publications.

- If they object that it will diminish their rights or control over their work, then they don't understand the rights-retention aspect of the policy, the terms of standard publishing contracts, or both. Authors sign away most of their rights under standard publishing contracts. In fact, increasing author rights and control is the primary rationale of a rights-retention OA policy. Be explicit in reassuring them that they have more rights and control over their work under this policy than under a standard publishing agreement.

- If they object that it will give the university ownership of their work, then they don't understand non-exclusive rights, the terms of standard publishing contracts, or both. The policy grants no exclusive rights to the institution, only non-exclusive rights. By contrast, faculty routinely grant exclusive rights to publishers through standard publishing agreements.

- If they object that they will be subject to a new form of coercion, then they are overlooking the waiver option, misinterpreting the word "mandate", or both. If this kind of policy is called a "mandate", it's only because the policy is stronger than a request or encouragement. But it's not a mandate in any other sense. The waiver option means that faculty retain the freedom to decide for or against OA for every one of their publications. Where the word "mandate" may be a problem, don't use the word, and where the word is already causing problems, help faculty focus on the terms of the policy rather than the implications of a very imperfect label for the policy. (More under "Mandate" below.) (See p. 63)

- These objections are especially common on campuses where faculty distrust of administrators runs high. Sometimes faculty do understand the green/gold distinction, the waiver option, rights-retention, and non-exclusive rights. But when they distrust administrators, they often see a draft OA policy as an attempted power grab by the administration. When this is a risk, be especially clear on the points above (the green/gold distinction, the waiver option, rights-retention, and non-exclusive rights), but also be clear on the fact that the policy is a faculty initiative. It is drafted by faculty and will be voted upon by faculty. Be clear that it enhances author prerogatives (control over their work and distribution channels for their work), while preserving their freedom to decide for or against OA and their freedom to submit their work to the journals of their choice. These are the reasons why so many OA policies have been approved by unanimous faculty votes[558].

- At schools where faculty worry that administrators may claim control over faculty publications under the work-for-hire doctrine, it helps to point out that the kind of policy recommended here reaffirms that these rights belong to faculty. Through the policy, faculty grant (non-exclusive) rights to the institution, and this would not be possible if the rights did not belong to faculty. The policy could be construed as a way to deny work-for-hire and then to grant the institution non-exclusive rights for faculty benefit on faculty terms.

2. "COMPLIANCE"

Policies of the type recommended here have three components: permission, waivers, and deposits.

- On the first component (permissions), compliance reaches 100% as soon as the policy is adopted.

- On the second component (waivers), campus leaders should acknowledge that faculty who obtain waivers are still complying with the policy. They are not violating the letter or spirit of the policy. The policy deliberately accommodates those who need or want waivers.

- The third component (deposits) often requires education, assistance, and incentives. But even though the deposit rate generally starts low and grows slowly, and occupies most of the attention of those charged with implementing a policy, it doesn't follow that the deposit rate is the only component of the compliance rate.

3. "INSTITUTIONAL REPOSITORY"

University OA policies generally require deposit in the institutional repository, and we recommend that practice. In this sense, an institutional repository tries to gather the research output of an institution, as opposed to a central, subject, or disciplinary repository, which tries to gather the research output of a field. When we're discussing different kinds of repository, "institutional repository" is unambiguous and unfrightening.

However, many faculty do not realize that institutional repositories are indexed by major (academic and non-academic) search engines,

and are interoperable with other repositories. Many faculty think that an institutional repository is a walled garden or a silo of content only visible to people who know the repository exists and take the trouble to make a special visit and run a special search. In addition, most faculty identify more with their field than their institution. Hence, when we're discussing the terms of a university OA policy, the term "institutional repository" may reinforce the false beliefs that the deposited works are institution-bound, invisible, and provincially identified with an institution more than with the author or topic. In discussing university OA policies, then, it may be better to emphasize the sense which institutional repositories are OA, open for indexing by any search engine, and interoperable with other repositories. They do not wall off content into institutional si-los but openly distribute content using institutional resources. They are designed to expose content to searchers, and most readers will find the repository's content through cross-repository searches than through local searches or browsing. For all these reasons, many faculty will find "open-access repository" and "repository" less confusing terms than "institutional repository".

4. "MANDATE"

If the word "mandate" suggests commands or coercion incompatible with academic freedom, then avoid it. The kind of policy recommended here is not implemented through commands or coercion. First, it is self-imposed by faculty vote. Second, it contains a waiver option and merely shifts the default. It would be a mistake to let the understandable desire to avoid the ugly implications of the word "mandate" lead faculty to defeat a policy that was not a mandate in the ugly sense. The kind of policy recommended here preserves faculty freedom to choose for or against OA for every publication.

- On the other hand, the policy recommended here is considerably stronger than a mere request or encourage-ment. The chief rationale for the word "mandate" is that English doesn't seem to give us better options for a policy that goes well beyond requests and encouragement and yet stops short of commands and coercion. (If you have a better alternative, please come forward!)

- For more detail, see Peter Suber, *Open Access*[559], MIT Press, 2012, Section 4.2, "Digression on the word 'Mandate'," pp. 86-90.

5. "OPT-OUT" AND "OPT-IN"

A waiver option creates an "opt-out" policy. In that sense it "shifts the default" from lack of permission for OA to permission for OA. After a rights-retention policy is adopted, faculty who don't lift a finger are granting the institution permission to make their future work OA; if they want a different outcome, they must lift a finger and obtain a waiver. The fact that the policy merely shifts the default, and still allows an opt-out or waiver, means that it is not a "mandate" in at least one common sense of the term. The word "mandate" may suggest a kind of requirement deliberately omitted from the policy. (On the other side, the policy is considerably stronger than a mere request or encouragement, and English has few words other than "mandate" to describe such a policy.) The waiver option or opt-out means that faculty remain free to choose for or against OA for each of their publications. The default shift means that most faculty most of the time will choose for OA.

Some institutions adopt what they call "opt-in" policies. But in effect the institution already had an opt-in policy and didn't need to adopt a policy to give the faculty the right to opt in to OA. In that sense, the opposite of an "opt-out" policy is not an "opt-in" policy, but a no-waiver policy (which is stronger) or a non-policy (which is weaker).

6. "WAIVERS"

The university should make works in the repository OA whenever it has permission to do so. The policy is one source of permission. When a faculty member obtains a waiver for a given article, then the university does not have OA permission from the policy for that article. But if the university has permission from another source, such as the publisher, then it doesn't need permission from the policy. A waiver of the license or permission under the university policy doesn't waive the license or permission that the university may have from the publisher. Hence, no one should talk about waivers as if they flatly block OA permission for a given work. They only block OA permission from the policy, not from other sources such as the publisher. In fact, the policy proponents should be explicit that the institution will make deposited work OA whenever it has permission to do so.

- Some faculty will overlook or misinterpret the waiver option and object that the policy limits their options and infringes their academic freedom. (We respond to this objection in the entry on academic freedom above.)

- Some faculty who are strong proponents of OA will raise the opposite objection, and argue that the waiver option should be deleted. They worry that it will gut the policy. They believe the waiver rate will be high —for example, 40%, 60%, or 80%— when the experience at every school with a waiver option is that the waiver rate is low. At both Harvard and MIT it's below 5%. Moreover, removing the waiver option will make it impossible to answer certain objections based on academic freedom. Not only could an unwaivable policy infringe academic freedom, it could fail to muster the votes needed to pass. Those pushing for an unwaivable OA policy may get no policy at all. Don't make the perfect an enemy of the good, and don't underestimate the ways in which shifting the default can change behavior on a large scale.

Revising this guide

CONTENTS

1. SUBSTANCE

Here are some topics under discussion. In some cases, we're still working out our recommendations. In some cases, good practices are hard to identify or yet to emerge.

How should universities assure OA for approved theses and dissertations?

- Until the guide adds entries on theses and dissertations, see Recommendation 1.2 of the ten-year anniversary statement of the Budapest Open Access Initiative[560] (September 2012): "Every institution of higher education offering advanced degrees should have a policy assuring that future theses and dissertations are deposited upon acceptance in the institution's OA repository. At the request of students who want to publish their work, or seek a patent on a patentable discovery, policies should grant reasonable delays rather than permanent exemptions." Also see Peter Suber, Open access to electronic theses and dissertations (ETDs)[561], *SPARC Open Access Newsletter,* July 2, 2006.

How should universities respond to publisher policies allowing green OA except at institutions with "OA mandates"?

2. PROCEDURE

The guide is written and edited by Stuart Shieber[562] and Peter Suber[563], in consultation with a growing list of experts. For the latest list, see the Preface.

To suggest a revision, or to be listed as an endorsing organization, please contact Stuart and Peter[564] directly.

Additional resources

CONTENTS

1. POLICIES OF THE KIND RECOMMENDED IN THE GUIDE

Chronological by date of adoption. Links point to policies, not institutional home pages.

1. [Harvard Faculty of Arts and Sciences](#)[565], February 12, 2008
2. [Harvard Law School](#)[566], May 1, 2008
3. [Stanford University School of Education](#)[567], June 26, 2008
4. [Harvard Kennedy School of Government](#)[568], March 10, 2009
5. [Massachusetts Institute of Technology](#)[569] (MIT), March 18, 2009
6. [University of Kansas](#)[570], April 30, 2009
7. [University of Oregon, Library Faculty](#)[571], May 7, 2009
8. [University of Oregon, Department of Romance Languages](#)[572], May 14, 2009
9. [Harvard Graduate School of Education](#)[573], June 1, 2009
10. [Trinity University](#)[574], October 27, 2009
11. [Oberlin College](#)[575], November 18, 2009
12. [Wake Forest University, Library Faculty](#)[576], February 1, 2010
13. [Harvard Business School](#)[577], February 12, 2010
14. [Rollins College](#)[578], February 25, 2010
15. [Duke University](#)[579], March 18, 2010
16. [University of Puerto Rico Law School](#)[580], March 24, 2010
17. [Harvard Divinity School](#)[581], November 15, 2010
18. [The University of Hawaii-Manoa](#)[582], Faculty Senate December 2010, Final adoption March 2012
19. [Columbia University, Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory](#)[583], December 22, 2010
20. [Strathmore University](#)[584], c. February 2011
21. [Emory University](#)[585], March 15, 2011
22. [Harvard Graduate School of Design](#)[586], March 20, 2011
23. [Columbia University Libraries](#)[587], June 1, 2011

24. [Princeton University](#)[588], September 19, 2011
25. [Hope College](#)[589], October 15, 2011
26. [Bifröst University](#)[590] (in English), or [in Icelandic](#)[591], first vote May 2011; confirmed January 2012
27. [Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and Technology](#)[592], c. March 2012
28. [Utah State University](#)[593], April 2012
29. [Miami University of Ohio, Library faculty](#)[594], May 14, 2012
30. [University of California - San Francisco](#)[595], May 21, 2012
31. [University of Massachusetts Medical School](#)[596], July 27, 2012
32. [McGill University Librarians](#)[597], c. October 2012.
33. [Rutgers University](#)[598], October 19, 2012
34. [Harvard School of Public Health](#)[599], November 26, 2012
35. [Georgia Institute of Technology](#)[600], November 27, 2012
36. [Olin College of Engineering](#)[601], November 28, 2012
37. [University of Nairobi](#)[602], December 2012
38. [Wellesley College](#)[603], February 6, 2013
39. [College of Wooster](#)[604], March 4, 2013
40. [Amherst College](#)[605], March 5, 2013
41. [University of Rhode Island](#)[606], March 21, 2013
42. [Stanford doctoral students at the Graduate School of Education](#)[607], May 24, 2013
43. [Oregon State University](#)[608], June 13, 2013
44. [University of California](#)[609], July 24, 2013

2. OTHER RECOMMENDATIONS FOR UNIVERSITY OA POLICIES

- BOAI (Budapest Open Access Initiative), [Ten years on from the Budapest Open Access Initiative: setting the default to open](#)[610], September 12, 2012. The ten-year anniversary statement from the BOAI, with recommendations for policy and practice.

- COAR (Confederation of Open Access Repositories), [Incentives, Integration, and Mediation: Sustainable Practices for Populating Repositories](#)[611], June 18, 2013.

- Ellen Finnie Duranceau and Sue Kriegsman, [Implementing Open Access Policies Using Institutional Repositories](#)[612], chapter 5 of Pamela Bluh and Cindy Hepfer (eds.), *The Institutional Repository: Benefits and Challenges,* American Library Association, Association for Library Collections and Technical Services (ALCTS), January 2013.

- EOS (Enabling Open Scholarship), Formulating an institutional Open Access policy[613].

- Stevan Harnad, Integrating Institutional and Funder Open Access Mandates: Belgian Model[614], Open Access Archivangelism, December 23, 2011.

- Stevan Harnad, Waking OA's "Slumbering Giant": The University's Mandate To Mandate Open Access[615], New Review of Information Networking 14, 1 (2008) pp. 51-68.

- Harvard Office for Scholarly Communication, Harvard Model Open Access Policy[616]. Annotated. Last updated, October 10, 2012.

- OASIS (Open Access Scholarly Information Sourcebook), Developing an Institutional Open Access Policy[617], April 7, 2012.

- RCAAP (Repositório Científico de Acesso Aberto de Portugal), Open Access Policies Kit[618], March 31, 2011.

- Arthur Sale, Marc Couture, Eloy Rodrigues, Leslie Carr, and Stevan Harnad, Open Access Mandates and the "Fair Dealing" Button[619], in: Rosemary J. Coombe and Darren Wershler, eds., *Dynamic Fair Dealing: Creating Canadian Culture Online,* 2012.

- Stuart Shieber, The Occasional Pamphlet[620]. Blog entries on scholarly communication.

- SPARC (Scholarly Publishing and Academic Resources Coalition), A SPARC Guide for Campus Action[621], April 25, 2012.

- SPARC, Campus Open Access Policies project[622], launched August 5, 2009.

- Peter Suber, OA policy options for funding agencies and universities[623], SPARC Open Access Newsletter, February 2, 2009.

- Peter Suber, Three principles for university open access policies[624], SPARC Open Access Newsletter, April 2, 2008.

- Alma Swan, Policy Guidelines for the Development and Promotion of Open Access[625], UNESCO, March 2012.

3. UNIVERSITY OA POLICIES IN GENERAL

COAPI (Coalition of Open Access Policy Institutions), Institution Contacts and their Open Access Policies[626]

ROARMAP[627] (Registry of Open Access Repositories Mandatory Archiving Policies). The most comprehensive list of university OA mandates.

Unanimous faculty votes for university OA policies[628]. A list maintained by the Open Access Directory[629].

Relevant tag libraries from the Open Access Tracking Project[630]. These are archives of alerts to news and comment on certain OA subtopics. The library for each tag is updated in real time and includes links to live RSS and Atom feeds:

- Items tagged with "oa.best_practices"[631] (including best practices on all OA-related topics, not just university OA policies)
- items tagged with "oa.case.policies.universities"[632] (case studies of university OA policies)
- Items tagged with "oa.case.repositories"[633] (case studies of OA repositories)
- Items tagged with "oa.deposits"[634] (on depositing work in institutional repositories)
- Items tagged with "oa.ir"[635] (for "institutional repositories")
- Items tagged with "oa.mandates"[636] (including funder mandates, not just university mandates)
- Items tagged with "oa.policies"[637] (including funder policies, not just university policies)

(Endnotes)

1 http://bit.ly/goodoa

2 http://cyber.law.harvard.edu/node/8005

3 http://www.opensocietyfoundations.org/openaccess/boai-10-recommendations

4 http://www.seas.harvard.edu/~shieber/

5 http://cyber.law.harvard.edu/~psuber/wiki/Peter_Suber

6 shieber@seas.harvard.edu; psuber@cyber.law.harvard.edu

7 http://www.arl.org/sparc/about/COAPI/index.shtml

8 http://www.coar-repositories.org/

9 http://www.eifl.net/

10 http://www.openscholarship.org/

11 http://cyber.law.harvard.edu/hoap

12 http://www.medoanet.eu/

13 http://oad.simmons.edu/

14 http://www.open-access.org.uk/

15 http://www.openoasis.org/

16 http://www.arl.org/sparc/

17 http://www.sparceurope.org/

18 http://sciencecommons.org/wp-content/uploads/Opening-the-Door.pdf

19 http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1890467

20 https://blogs.law.harvard.edu/pamphlet/2012/09/17/is-the-harvard-open-access-policy-legally-sound/

21 http://www.opensocietyfoundations.org/openaccess/boai-10-recommendations

22 http://www.sherpa.ac.uk/romeo/PDFandIR.php?la=en

23 http://library.duke.edu/openaccess/duke-openaccess-policy.html

24 http://osc.hul.harvard.edu/sites/default/files/model-policy-annotated_0.pdf

25 http://osc.hul.harvard.edu/sites/default/files/model-policy-annotated_0.pdf

26 http://www.opensocietyfoundations.org/openaccess/read

27 http://osc.hul.harvard.edu/modelpolicy

28 http://creativecommons.org/licenses/

29 http://osc.hul.harvard.edu/dash/termsofuse

30 http://www.oacompact.org/

31 http://www.library.ucsf.edu/sites/all/files/ucsf_assets/ucsf_oa_faqs.pdf

32 http://osc.universityofcalifornia.edu/openaccesspolicy/ucsf/faq.html

33 http://scholcomm.columbia.edu/open-access/open-access-policies/frequently-asked-questions/

34 http://library.duke.edu/openaccess/duke-openaccess-policy.html

35 http://osc.hul.harvard.edu/policies

36 http://libraries.mit.edu/sites/scholarly/mit-open-access/open-access-at-mit/mit-open-access-policy/mit-faculty-open-access-policy-faq/

[37] http://ed.stanford.edu/faculty-research/open-archive/open-access-qa

[38] http://codes.lp.findlaw.com/uscode/17/2/205

[39] http://www.jisc.ac.uk/whatwedo/programmes/pals3/pirus.aspx

[40] http://blogs.law.harvard.edu/pamphlet/2011/03/12/the-importance-of-dark-deposit/

[41] http://www.sherpa.ac.uk/romeo/PDFandIR.php?la=en

[42] http://www.opensocietyfoundations.org/openaccess/boai-10-recommendations

[43] http://oaseminar.fecyt.es/Publico/AlhambraDeclaration/index.aspx

[44] http://www.earlham.edu/~peters/fos/2005/04/choosing-oa-and-getting-tenure-too.html

[45] http://www.jiscinfonet.ac.uk/infokits/repositories/technical-framework/search

[46] http://support.google.com/webmasters/bin/answer.py?hl=en&answer=35769

[47] http://osc.hul.harvard.edu/sites/default/files/model-pub-agreement-090430.pdf

[48] http://scholars.sciencecommons.org/

[49] http://libraries.mit.edu/forms/dspace-oa-articles.html

[50] http://web.mit.edu/newsoffice/2012/the-worldwide-impact-of-open-access-to-mit-faculty-research.html

[51] https://osc.hul.harvard.edu/dash/stories

[52] http://www.sun.ac.za/

[53] http://bit.ly/garpir

[54] http://scholar.sun.ac.za/

[55] http://wiki.lib.sun.ac.za/index.php/SUNScholar/Audit/Section_9

[56] http://www.qut.edu.au/

[57] http://rubric.edu.au/packages/RUBRIC_Toolkit/docs/Publicity_and_Marketing/PaulaCallan.ppt

[58] http://www.columbia.edu/

[59] http://www.rsp.ac.uk/events/implementing-strategies-to-encourage-deposit/

[60] http://www.massey.ac.nz/massey/home.cfm

[61] http://www.ira.auckland.ac.nz/docs/fox.pdf

[62] http://www.usq.edu.au/

[63] http://rubric.edu.au/packages/RUBRIC_Toolkit/docs/Publicity_and_Marketing/USQ_ePrints_Marketing06.pdf

[64] http://www.uillinois.edu/

[65] http://www.umass.edu/

[66] http://www.umich.edu/

[67] http://www1.umn.edu/twincities/index.html

[68] http://www.osu.edu/

[69] http://works.bepress.com/ir_research/30/

[70] http://www.bc.edu/

[71] http://www.hku.hk/

[72] http://www.sun.ac.za/

[73] http://www.helsinki.fi/university/

[74] http://www.ncsu.edu/

[75] http://umanitoba.ca/

[76] http://home.byu.edu/home/

[77] http://cds.cern.ch/record/1186468/?ln=hr

[78] http://www.csic.es/web/guest/home

[79] http://proyectos.bibliotecas.csic.es/digitalcsic/semana_acceso_abier-to/2012/index.html

[80] http://digital.csic.es/revista-csic-abierto/

[81] http://digital.csic.es/bitstream/10261/52123/4/Digital_CSIC_2011_eng.pdf

[82] http://www.jiscinfonet.ac.uk/research

[83] http://www.jiscinfonet.ac.uk/infokits/repositories

[84] http://www.jiscinfonet.ac.uk/infokits/repositories/management-framework/advocacy

[85] http://www.jiscinfonet.ac.uk/infokits/repositories/management-framework/culture-change

[86] http://www.jiscinfonet.ac.uk/infokits/repositories/management-framework/core-message

[87] http://www.jiscinfonet.ac.uk/infokits/repositories/management-framework/options

[88] http://www.jiscinfonet.ac.uk/infokits/repositories/management-framework/activities

[89] https://mx2.arl.org/lists/sparc-oaforum/Message/5399.html

[90] http://www.ucl.ac.uk/

[91] http://discovery.ucl.ac.uk/116819/1/116819.pdf

[92] http://www.qut.edu.au/

[93] http://eprints.qut.edu.au/573/

[94] http://www.coar-repositories.org/

[95] http://drf.lib.hokudai.ac.jp/drf/

[96] http://drf.lib.hokudai.ac.jp/drf/index.php?plugin=attach&refer=Digital%20Repository%20Federation%20%28in%20English%29&openfile=hitahita2011.pdf

[97] http://www.uni-konstanz.de/willkommen/

[98] http://open-access.net/de/wissenswertes_fuer/betreiber_von_repositorien/einwerben_von_dokumenten/

[99] http://www.coar-repositories.org/files/Sustainable-best-practices_final1.pdf

[100] http://www.eifl.net/eifl-oa-case-studies

[101] http://www.uz.ac.zw/

[102] http://www.kcn.unima.mw/

[103] http://www.lu.lv/eng/

[104] http://www.uofk.edu/

[105] http://www.eifl.net/news/eifl-open-access-advocacy-grants-deliver-big-

[106] http://www.exeter.ac.uk/

[107] http://jiscreposit.blogspot.com/2011/01/university-of-exeter-advocacy-plan.html

[108] http://www.uminho.pt/

[109] http://www.dlib.org/dlib/january08/ferreira/01ferreira.html

[110] http://www.vads.ac.uk/kultur2group/projects/kultivate/index.html

[111] http://www.vads.ac.uk/kultur2group/toolkits/advocacy/index.html

[112] http://rspproject.wordpress.com/2011/07/15/two-new-toolkits-to-kulti-vate-artistic-research-deposit/

[113] http://www.uclan.ac.uk/

[114] http://ie-repository.jisc.ac.uk/503/

[115] http://www.ethz.ch/index_EN

[116] http://mit.edu/

[117] http://www.rochester.edu/

[118] http://www.ariadne.ac.uk/issue49/giereveld/

[119] https://www.jyu.fi/en/

[120] https://jyx.jyu.fi/dspace/bitstream/handle/123456789/37729/OA-Sur-vey_Results.pdf?sequence=1&goback=.gde_3304213_member_111833028

[121] http://crc.nottingham.ac.uk/

[122] http://web.archive.org/web/20100831194756/http://researchcommunica-tions.jiscinvolve.org/wp/2010/02/04/peer-baseline-why-dont-authors-deposit/

[123] http://www.cam.ac.uk/

[124] http://www.uhi.ac.uk/

[125] http://jiscreposit.blogspot.com/2010/08/literature-review-ctrep-cam-bridge-tetra.html

[126] http://www.southampton.ac.uk/

[127] http://www.jisc-collections.ac.uk/UKSGFiles/272/UKSGeNews272.pdf

[128] http://ubuea.net/

[129] http://wiredspace.wits.ac.za/bitstream/handle/10539/8952/37%20Koel-en%20Shafack,%20Ngum.pdf?sequence=1

[130] http://ktisis.cut.ac.cy/

[131] http://www.cut.ac.cy/

[132] http://ktisis.cut.ac.cy/handle/10488/4837

[133] http://oregonstate.edu/

[134] http://hdl.handle.net/1957/11003

[135] http://www.dmu.ac.uk/home.aspx

[136] http://www.rsp.ac.uk/documents/get-uploaded-file/?file=DORA%20pre-sentation%20Feb%202010%20270112%20pptx.pptx

[137] http://www.gla.ac.uk/

[138] http://www.lib.gla.ac.uk/daedalus/index.html

[139] http://www.ariadne.ac.uk/issue39/mackie

[140] http://www.rochester.edu/

[141] http://ifla.queenslibrary.org/IV/ifla72/papers/155-Mark_Shearer-en.pdf

[142] http://illinois.edu/

[143] http://www.umass.edu/

[144] http://www.umich.edu/

[145] http://www1.umn.edu/twincities/index.html

[146] http://www.osu.edu/

[147] http://smartech.gatech.edu/bitstream/handle/1853/28419/118-449-1-PB.pdf

148 http://www.rollins.edu/

149 http://rollins-olin-library.blogspot.com/2010/06/creating-change-in-scholarly.html

150 http://www.gla.ac.uk/

151 http://www.rsp.ac.uk/documents/get-uploaded-file/?file=Nixon_JISCRTE_Feb2012.ppt

152 http://www.kzoo.edu/

153 https://cache.kzoo.edu/handle/10920/3593

154 http://docs.lib.purdue.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1131&context=lib_research

155 http://www.northampton.ac.uk/

156 http://www.rsp.ac.uk/documents/get-uploaded-file/?file=Bringing%20a%20buzz%20to%20NECTAR%20JISCrte%20event%20100212%20%282%29.pptx

157 http://www.caltech.edu/

158 http://www.istl.org/06-summer/viewpoints.html

159 http://www.southampton.ac.uk/

160 http://arno.uvt.nl/show.cgi?fid=68185

161 http://www.uminho.pt/

162 http://arno.uvt.nl/show.cgi?fid=68188

163 http://www.st-andrews.ac.uk/

164 http://hdl.handle.net/10023/1824

165 http://www.calpoly.edu/

166 http://www.ala.org/alcts/resources/papers/irs#2

167 http://www.ipcb.pt/en/

168 http://liber.library.uu.nl/index.php/lq/article/view/8047/8436

169 http://www.gsu.edu/

170 http://digitalarchive.gsu.edu/

171 http://lj.libraryjournal.com/2012/09/opinion/backtalk/gsu-library-promotes-open-access-to-new-faculty-backtalk/

172 http://www.open.ac.uk/

173 http://oro.open.ac.uk/22321/

174 http://www.sun.ac.za/

175 http://wiki.lib.sun.ac.za/images/0/0e/Marketing.pdf

176 http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/29804/1/Research_spectrum.pdf

177 http://www2.lse.ac.uk/home.aspx

178 http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/

179 http://www.gla.ac.uk/

180 http://open-access.org.uk/

181 http://open-access.org.uk/information-and-guidance

182 http://open-access.org.uk/information-and-guidance/advocacy

183 http://open-access.org.uk/information-and-guidance/advocacy-key-resources

184 http://www.ulg.ac.be/cms/c_5000/home

185 http://www.southampton.ac.uk/

186 http://www.qut.edu.au/

187 http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=1uIf6awDzCo

[188] http://enlightenrepository.wordpress.com/2011/05/13/open-access-repositories-resource-pack-oarrpack/

[189] http://www.wrn.aber.ac.uk/

[190] http://welshrepositorynetwork.blogspot.com/2010/06/advocacy-discussion-barriers-and.html

[191] http://library.web.cern.ch/library/

[192] http://library.web.cern.ch/library/Webzine/12/papers/2/

[193] http://bibapp.org/

[194] http://bibapp.org/2010/07/01/bibapp-10-released/

[195] https://connections.ideals.illinois.edu/

[196] http://bibapp.mbl.edu/

[197] http://experts.kumc.edu/

[198] http://www.mh-hannover.de/index.php?&L=1

[199] http://blogs.plos.org/mfenner/2010/10/26/self-motivated-vs-mandated-archiving/

[200] http://www.opendoar.org/

[201] http://muse.jhu.edu/login?auth=0&type=summary&url=/journals/portal_libraries_and_the_academy/v011/11.2.hanlon.html

[202] http://www.eprints.org/depositmo/

[203] http://blogs.ecs.soton.ac.uk/depositmo/

[204] http://www.ariadne.ac.uk/issue68/gramstadt

[205] http://blog.soton.ac.uk/depositmo/

[206] http://www.jisc.ac.uk/whatwedo/programmes/inf11/jiscdepo.aspx

[207] http://scholarship20.blogspot.com/2012/11/deposit-strand.html

[208] http://www.jisc.ac.uk/whatwedo/programmes/inf11/jiscdepo/dura.aspx

[209] http://www.symplectic.co.uk/news-events/2012/05/16/dura-project-with-mendeley-and-caret/

[210] http://www.symplectic.co.uk/product-tour.html

[211] http://www.symplectic.co.uk/product-tour.html

[212] http://easydeposit.swordapp.org/

[213] http://swordapp.org/

[214] http://easydeposit.swordapp.org/

[215] http://blog.stuartlewis.com/2010/05/29/deposit-to-multiple-repositories/

[216] https://github.com/stuartlewis/EasyDeposit/wiki

[217] http://www.library.auckland.ac.nz/

[218] http://blog.stuartlewis.com/2010/02/03/easydeposit-sword-deposit-tool-creator/

[219] http://www.openarchives.org/OAI/openarchivesprotocol.html

[220] http://www.ibm.com/developerworks/industry/library/ind-edustand3/index.html

[221] http://edina.ac.uk/projects/oa-rj/index.html

[222] http://opendepot.org/

[223] http://edina.ac.uk/projects/ORI_summary.html

[224] http://ori.edina.ac.uk/index.html

[225] http://puma.uni-kassel.de/

[226] http://www.bibsonomy.org/

227 http://blog.bibsonomy.org/2009/08/puma-project-on-academic-publication.html

228 http://jiscreposit.blogspot.com/2010/07/introducing-reposit.html

229 http://jiscreposit.blogspot.com/

230 http://www.leeds.ac.uk/

231 http://www.keele.ac.uk/

232 http://www.qmul.ac.uk/

233 http://www.exeter.ac.uk/

234 http://www.plymouth.ac.uk/

235 http://www.symplectic.co.uk/

236 http://www.cam.ac.uk/

237 http://www.uhi.ac.uk/

238 http://jiscreposit.blogspot.com/2010/08/literature-review-ctrep-cambridge-tetra.html

239 http://edina.ac.uk/projects/RJB_summary.html

240 http://www.rsp.ac.uk/documents/get-uploaded-file/?file=RJ_Broker_RSP_event_12_June_mm_2013.pptx

241 http://www.nature.com/

242 http://europepmc.org/

243 http://www.rsp.ac.uk/documents/get-uploaded-file/?file=RJ_Broker_RSP_event_12_June_mm_2013.pptx

244 http://swordapp.org/

245 http://cottagelabs.com/intro-to-sword-2/

246 http://www.biomedcentral.com/

247 http://web.mit.edu/

248 https://mx2.arl.org/lists/sparc-oaforum/Message/5456.html

249 http://www.coar-repositories.org/

250 http://www.peerproject.eu/

251 http://www.peerproject.eu/fileadmin/media/reports/D3_1_Guidelines_v8.3_20090528.Final.pdf

252 http://www.coar-repositories.org/files/Sustainiable-practices-preliminary-results_final.pdf

253 http://mit.edu/

254 http://uksg.metapress.com/content/l437x1631052407r/

255 http://www.dlib.org/dlib/january12/lewis/01lewis.html

256 http://www.arkiv.org

257 http://dataconservancy.org/

258 https://conferences.tdl.org/or/OR2011/OR2011main/paper/viewFile/403/97

259 http://www.coar-repositories.org/

260 http://www.griffith.edu.au/

261 http://www.coar-repositories.org/files/Sustainiable-practices-preliminary-results_final.pdf

262 http://www.uminho.pt/

263 http://www.dlib.org/dlib/january08/ferreira/01ferreira.html

264 http://www.cut.ac.cy/

265 http://www.slideshare.net/LibraryCUT/scholar-publications-and-open-ac-cess-policies-the-ktisis-case

266 http://community.ucreative.ac.uk/index.cfm?articleid=20661

267 http://www.research.ucreative.ac.uk/copyright.html

268 http://www.ariadne.ac.uk/issue68/gramstadt

269 http://www.southampton.ac.uk/

270 http://www.lshtm.ac.uk/

271 http://researchonline.lshtm.ac.uk/

272 http://lshtmresearchonline.blogspot.com/2012/05/how-and-why-lshtm-research-online-works.html?m=1

273 http://www.gla.ac.uk/

274 http://www.ariadne.ac.uk/issue39/mackie

275 http://www.cornell.edu/

276 http://ifla.queenslibrary.org/IV/ifla72/papers/155-Mark_Shearer-en.pdf

277 http://illinois.edu/

278 http://www.umass.edu/

279 http://www.umich.edu/

280 http://www1.umn.edu/twincities/index.html

281 http://www.osu.edu/

282 http://smartech.gatech.edu/bitstream/handle/1853/28419/118-449-1-PB.pdf

283 http://www.gla.ac.uk/

284 http://www.rsp.ac.uk/documents/get-uploaded-file/?file=Nixon_JIS-CRTE_Feb2012.ppt

285 http://oregonstate.edu/

286 http://connect.ala.org/files/25884/andrea_wirth_oapolicynotes062710_pdf_18762.pdf

287 http://www.sun.ac.za/

288 http://bit.ly/garpir

289 http://scholar.sun.ac.za/

290 http://wiki.lib.sun.ac.za/index.php/SUNScholar/Asset_Presentation

291 http://wiki.lib.sun.ac.za/index.php/SUNScholar/Community_Management

292 http://wiki.lib.sun.ac.za/index.php/SUNScholar/Asset_Submissions

293 http://wiki.lib.sun.ac.za/index.php/SUNScholar/Indexes

294 http://wiki.lib.sun.ac.za/index.php/SUNScholar/Audit/Section_7

295 http://www.qut.edu.au/

296 http://rubric.edu.au/packages/RUBRIC_Toolkit/docs/Publicity_and_Market-ing/PaulaCallan.ppt

297 http://www.mh-hannover.de/index.php?&L=1

298 https://www.escidoc.org/

299 http://blogs.plos.org/mfenner/2010/10/26/self-motivated-vs-mandated-archiving/

300 http://www.uminho.pt/

301 http://www.dlib.org/dlib/january08/ferreira/01ferreira.html

302 http://docs.lib.purdue.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1131&contex-

t=lib_research

[303] http://www.csic.es/web/guest/home

[304] http://www.researchinformation.info/features/feature.php?feature_id=183

[305] http://digital.csic.es/bitstream/10261/52123/4/Digital_CSIC_2011_eng.pdf

[306] http://www.ulg.ac.be/cms/c_5000/home

[307] http://www.richardpoynder.co.uk/Rentier_Interview.pdf

[308] http://www.uminho.pt/

[309] http://www.southampton.ac.uk/

[310] http://public.web.cern.ch/public/

[311] http://arno.uvt.nl/show.cgi?fid=68182

[312] http://dare.uva.nl/document/93898

[313] http://www.cornell.edu/

[314] http://vivo.cornell.edu/

[315] http://www.ox.ac.uk/

[316] http://brii.medsci.ox.ac.uk/

[317] http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/13614533.2010.509996

[318] http://www.southampton.ac.uk/

[319] http://www.stir.ac.uk/

[320] http://www.uminho.pt/en/home_en

[321] http://eprints.soton.ac.uk/268511/1/saledraftv5.pdf

[322] http://www.open.ac.uk/

[323] http://oro.open.ac.uk/22321/

[324] http://www.cmu.edu/index.shtml

[325] http://journals.tdl.org/jodi/article/view/2068

[326] http://ir.uiowa.edu/about.html

[327] http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/0361526X.2013.800632

[328] http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=lA-6d-FP-b4&list=PLA5071430DFE-028CE&index=4&feature=plpp_video

[329] http://www.gsu.edu/

[330] http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/0361526X.2013.800632

[331] http://www.qut.edu.au/

[332] http://rubric.edu.au/packages/RUBRIC_Toolkit/docs/Publicity_and_Marketing/PaulaCallan.ppt

[333] http://www.columbia.edu/

[334] http://www.rsp.ac.uk/events/implementing-strategies-to-encourage-deposit/

[335] http://www.gsa.ac.uk/search?search=radar

[336] http://radar.gsa.ac.uk/

[337] http://www.rsp.ac.uk/documents/get-uploaded-file/?file=JISC_Radar.pptx

[338] http://www.ucreative.ac.uk/

[339] http://www.vads.ac.uk/kultur2group/toolkits/decision-making/index.html

[340] http://rspproject.wordpress.com/2011/07/15/two-new-toolkits-to-kulti-vate-artistic-research-deposit/

[341] http://www.rca.ac.uk/

342 http://www.vads.ac.uk/kultur2group/casestudies/RCA2011.pdf

343 http://www.ariadne.ac.uk/issue68/gramstadt

344 http://www.southampton.ac.uk/

345 http://www.jisc-collections.ac.uk/UKSGFiles/272/UKSGeNews272.pdf

346 http://www.csic.es/web/guest/home

347 http://www.csic.es/web/guest/home

348 http://www.tdl.org/

349 http://sourceforge.net/projects/vireo/

350 http://www.imls.gov/

351 http://www.tdl.org/2010/09/tdl-releases-vireo-etd-system-open-source-software/

352 http://www.vt.edu/

353 http://www.coar-repositories.org/news/sparc-open-access-meeting-notes/

354 http://www.southampton.ac.uk/

355 http://www.jisc-collections.ac.uk/UKSGFiles/272/UKSGeNews272.pdf

356 http://www.gla.ac.uk/

357 http://www.ariadne.ac.uk/issue39/mackie

358 http://www.jisc.ac.uk/whatwedo/programmes/inf11/reptakeup.aspx

359 http://www.rsp.ac.uk/events/embedding-and-integrating-repositories/#programme

360 http://www.dmu.ac.uk/home.aspx

361 http://www2.hull.ac.uk/

362 http://www.mdx.ac.uk/

363 http://www.northampton.ac.uk/

364 http://www.vads.ac.uk/

365 http://www.ucreative.ac.uk/

366 http://www.arts.ac.uk/

367 http://rspproject.wordpress.com/2012/02/14/how-embedded-and-integrated-is-your-repository/

368 http://atira.dk/en/pure/

369 http://www.st-andrews.ac.uk/

370 http://www.abdn.ac.uk/

371 http://www.york.ac.uk/

372 http://www.ukoln.ac.uk/rim/projects/cris-oar/uk-overview.pdf

373 http://www.rsp.ac.uk/embeddingguide/introduction-to-the-guide-2/case-study-aberdeen/

374 http://www.rsp.ac.uk/embeddingguide/introduction-to-the-guide-2/case-study-nectar/

375 http://www.rsp.ac.uk/embeddingguide/introduction-to-the-guide-2/case-study-dundee/

376 http://rspproject.wordpress.com/2011/12/13/rsp-embedding-guide/

377 http://www.rsp.ac.uk/embeddingguide/self-assessment-tool/

378 http://www.uc3m.es/portal/page/portal/home

379 http://legacy.earlham.edu/~peters/fos/2009/04/universidad-carlos-iii-de-madrid-adopts.html

380 http://webcast.in2p3.fr/videos-rodrigues

381 http://www.uminho.pt/

382 http://www.dlib.org/dlib/january08/ferreira/01ferreira.html

383 http://arno.uvt.nl/show.cgi?fid=68188

384 http://www.hioa.no/

385 http://web.archive.org/web/20101218023449/http:/hio.no/Aktuelt/HiO-nytt/Arkiverte-nyheter/2010/02/Last-inn-i-ODA

386 http://www.uminho.pt/

387 http://webcast.in2p3.fr/videos-rodrigues

388 http://www.uzh.ch/about_en.html

389 http://dx.doi.org/10.1087/20110409

390 http://www.nrc-cnrc.gc.ca/eng/ibp/irc.html

391 http://www.springerlink.com/content/7700u176n83558k7/

392 http://www.ulg.ac.be/cms/c_5000/home

393 http://www.richardpoynder.co.uk/Rentier_Interview.pdf

394 http://listserver.sigmaxi.org/sc/wa.exe?A2=ind09&L=american-scientist-open-access-forum&D=1&O=D&F=l&S=&P=866

395 http://cyber.law.harvard.edu/hoap/Implementing_a_policy#Internal_use_of_deposited_versions

396 http://cyber.law.harvard.edu/hoap/Implementing_a_policy

397 http://www.bris.ac.uk/

398 http://researchrevealed.ilrt.bris.ac.uk/

399 http://www.jisc.ac.uk/

400 http://researchrevealed.ilrt.bris.ac.uk/files/2012/02/rr-evaluation-report-final.pdf

401 http://www.umich.edu/

402 http://www.icpsr.umich.edu/icpsrweb/landing.jsp

403 http://researchremix.wordpress.com/2013/01/10/first-draft-of-nature-comment/

404 http://www.qut.edu.au/

405 http://rubric.edu.au/packages/RUBRIC_Toolkit/docs/Publicity_and_Marketing/PaulaCallan.ppt

406 http://www.rsp.ac.uk/events/implementing-strategies-to-encourage-deposit/

407 http://www.kyushu-u.ac.jp/english/

408 http://hdl.handle.net/2324/18911

409 http://www.rochester.edu/

410 http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/13614533.2010.509517

411 http://www.qut.edu.au/

412 http://eprints.qut.edu.au/573/

413 http://www.st-andrews.ac.uk/

414 http://univstandrews-oaresearch.blogspot.com/2012/02/new-public-stats-now-available-for.html

415 http://www.coar-repositories.org/working-groups/repository-content/preliminary-report-sustainable-best-practices-for-populating-repositories/2-us-

ing-usage-statistics-to-encourage-deposits/

416 http://www.murdoch.edu.au/

417 http://creativecommons.org.au/research/openarchives

418 http://www.uminho.pt/

419 http://www.dlib.org/dlib/january08/ferreira/01ferreira.html

420 http://arno.uvt.nl/show.cgi?fid=68188

421 http://www.southampton.ac.uk/

422 http://www.jisc-collections.ac.uk/UKSGFiles/272/UKSGeNews272.pdf

423 http://www.dmu.ac.uk/home.aspx

424 http://www.rsp.ac.uk/documents/get-uploaded-file/?file=DORA%20pre-sentation%20Feb%2010%20270112%20pptx.pptx

425 http://escholarship.org/

426 http://ifla.queenslibrary.org/IV/ifla72/papers/155-Mark_Shearer-en.pdf

427 http://www.csic.es/web/guest/home

428 http://digital.csic.es/

429 http://www.researchinformation.info/features/feature.php?feature_id=183

430 http://www.elprofesionaldelainformacion.com/contenidos/2010/septiem-bre/15.html

431 http://www.southampton.ac.uk/

432 http://arno.uvt.nl/show.cgi?fid=68185

433 http://www.utas.edu.au/

434 http://www.harzing.com/pop.htm

435 https://mx2.arl.org/Lists/SPARC-OAForum/Message/5427.html

436 http://www.butler.edu/

437 http://www.uow.edu.au/index.html

438 http://digitalcommons.bepress.com/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1003&context=newsletter

439 http://www.manchester.ac.uk/

440 http://manchesterscholar.blogspot.com/2012/06/institutional-reposito-ries-and.html

441 http://www.columbia.edu/

442 http://www.rsp.ac.uk/events/implementing-strategies-to-encourage-deposit/

443 http://www.uillinois.edu/

444 http://www.umass.edu/

445 http://www.umich.edu/

446 http://www1.umn.edu/twincities/index.html

447 http://www.osu.edu/

448 http://works.bepress.com/ir_research/30/

449 http://about.orcid.org/

450 http://www.mh-hannover.de/index.php?&L=1

451 http://blogs.plos.org/mfenner/2010/10/26/self-motivated-vs-mandat-ed-archiving/

452 http://www.rca.ac.uk/

453 http://wiki.eprints.org/w/MePrints

454 http://www.ariadne.ac.uk/issue68/gramstadt

455 http://www.vads.ac.uk/kultur2group/downloads/20110804_eNova.pdf

456 http://www.cau.edu.cn/

457 http://www.dlib.org/dlib/july11/chenying/07chenying.print.html

458 http://www.narcis.nl/

459 http://www.rochester.edu/

460 http://ifla.queenslibrary.org/IV/ifla72/papers/155-Mark_Shearer-en.pdf

461 http://illinois.edu/

462 http://www.umass.edu/

463 http://www.umich.edu/

464 http://www1.umn.edu/twincities/index.html

465 http://www.osu.edu/

466 http://smartech.gatech.edu/bitstream/handle/1853/28419/118-449-1-PB.pdf

467 http://www.gla.ac.uk/

468 http://www.rsp.ac.uk/documents/get-uploaded-file/?file=Nixon_JIS-CRTE_Feb2012.ppt

469 http://www.unl.edu/

470 http://digitalcommons.bepress.com/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1003&context=newsletter

471 http://www.utas.edu.au/

472 http://eprints.utas.edu.au/es/index.php?action=show_detail_eprint;id=410

473 https://mx2.arl.org/Lists/SPARC-OAForum/Message/5427.html

474 http://www.rochester.edu/

475 http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/13614533.2010.509517

476 http://www.dlib.org/dlib/january05/foster/01foster.html

477 http://www.insidehighered.com/news/2010/03/02/repositories

478 http://www.sun.ac.za/

479 http://bit.ly/garpir

480 http://scholar.sun.ac.za/ http://scholar.sun.ac.za/

481 http://wiki.lib.sun.ac.za/index.php/SUNScholar/Guidelines/Step_10

482 http://wiki.lib.sun.ac.za/index.php/SUNScholar/Populating

483 http://wiki.lib.sun.ac.za/index.php/SUNScholar/Audit/Section_6

484 http://www.rubric.edu.au/

485 http://www.rubric.edu.au/techreports/migration_toolkit.htm

486 http://www.columbia.edu/

487 http://www.rsp.ac.uk/events/implementing-strategies-to-encourage-deposit/

488 http://www.wooster.edu/

489 https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=O9iTYO9VKfo

490 http://pastebin.com/sXknBHDq

491 http://www.uillinois.edu/

492 http://www.umass.edu/

493 http://www.umich.edu/

494 http://www1.umn.edu/twincities/index.html

495 http://www.osu.edu/

496 http://works.bepress.com/ir_research/30/

497 http://www.csic.es/web/guest/home

498 http://digital.csic.es/bitstream/10261/52123/4/Digital_CSIC_2011_eng.pdf

499 http://www.anu.edu.au/

500 http://www.coar-repositories.org/working-groups/repository-content/preliminary-report-sustainable-best-practices-for-populating-repositories/6-full-text-harvesting/

501 http://cairss.caul.edu.au/www/open_access/danny_kingsley/recruiting_material_for_repositories.pdf

502 http://web.mit.edu/

503 http://www.arl.org/sparc/meetings/oa12/sparc-open-access-meeting-speaker-slides.shtml

504 http://web.mit.edu/

505 http://www.biomedcentral.com/

506 http://uksg.metapress.com/content/l437x1631052407r/

507 http://web.mit.edu/newsoffice/2010/open-access-policy.html

508 http://uit.no/inenglish

509 http://nile.lub.lu.se/ojs/index.php/sciecominfo/article/view/5422/4748

510 http://www.harvard.edu/

511 http://osc.hul.harvard.edu/dash/fellows

512 http://openbiomed.info/2011/06/oa-fellows-harvard/

513 http://www.nrc-cnrc.gc.ca/eng/ibp/irc.html

514 http://www.springerlink.com/content/7700u176n83558k7/

515 http://www.cut.ac.cy/

516 http://ktisis.cut.ac.cy/handle/10488/4837

517 http://www.lshtm.ac.uk/

518 http://researchonline.lshtm.ac.uk/

519 http://lshtmresearchonline.blogspot.com/2012/05/how-and-why-lshtm-research-online-works.html?m=1

520 http://www.gla.ac.uk

521 http://www.lib.gla.ac.uk/daedalus/index.html

522 http://www.ariadne.ac.uk/issue39/mackie

523 http://www.ed.ac.uk/home

524 http://www.gla.ac.uk/

525 http://ifla.queenslibrary.org/IV/ifla72/papers/155-Mark_Shearer-en.pdf

526 http://docs.lib.purdue.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1131&context=lib_research

527 http://www.caltech.edu/

528 http://www.istl.org/06-summer/viewpoints.html

529 http://www.southampton.ac.uk/

530 http://arno.uvt.nl/show.cgi?fid=68185

531 http://public.web.cern.ch/public/

532 http://arno.uvt.nl/show.cgi?fid=68180

533 http://www.st-andrews.ac.uk/

534 http://hdl.handle.net/10023/1824

535 http://rspproject.wordpress.com/2011/01/10/guest-post-by-jackie-prov-en-increasing-repository-content-at-st-andrews-using-merit-data/

536 http://law.wm.edu/

537 http://www.wm.edu/news/stories/2012/law-scholarship-reposito-ry-scores-millionth-download.php

538 http://www.tdl.org/

539 http://sourceforge.net/projects/vireo/

540 http://www.tdl.org/2010/09/tdl-releases-vireo-etd-system-opensource-software/

541 http://etd.tamu.edu/

542 http://etd.tdl.org/ttu/

543 http://etd.lib.utexas.edu/etd_lib_utexas_edu.html

544 http://www.cmu.edu/index.shtml

545 http://journals.tdl.org/jodi/article/view/2068

546 http://www.bca.bw/

547 http://journals.sfu.ca/iaald/index.php/aginfo/article/view/127

548 http://www.unimelb.edu.au/

549 http://www.uq.edu.au/

550 http://www.qut.edu.au/

551 http://www.southampton.ac.uk/

552 http://www.strath.ac.uk/

553 http://www.gla.ac.uk/

554 http://www.lunduniversity.lu.se/

555 http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2007.09.020

556 http://library.web.cern.ch/library/

557 http://library.web.cern.ch/library/Webzine/12/papers/2/

558 http://oad.simmons.edu/oadwiki/Unanimous_faculty_votes

559 http://bit.ly/oa-book

560 http://www.soros.org/openaccess/boai-10-recommendations

561 http://nrs.harvard.edu/urn-3:HUL.InstRepos:4727443

562 http://www.seas.harvard.edu/~shieber/

563 http://bit.ly/suber-gplus

564 shieber@seas.harvard.edu; psuber@cyber.law.harvard.edu

565 http://osc.hul.harvard.edu/hfaspolicy

566 http://osc.hul.harvard.edu/hlspolicy

567 http://ed.stanford.edu/faculty-research/open-archive/open-access-motion

568 http://osc.hul.harvard.edu/hksgpolicy

569 http://libraries.mit.edu/sites/scholarly/mit-open-access/open-access-at-mit/mit-open-access-policy/

570 https://documents.ku.edu/policies/governance/OpenAccess.htm

571 https://mx2.arl.org/Lists/SPARC-OAForum/Message/4943.html

572 https://mx2.arl.org/Lists/SPARC-OAForum/Message/4950.html

573 http://osc.hul.harvard.edu/hgsepolicy

574 http://www.trinity.edu/org/senate/Trinity%20University%20Open%20
Access%20Policy.pdf

575 http://www.oberlin.edu/library/programs/openaccess/resolution.html

576 http://zsr.wfu.edu/documents/ZSR_Librarians_Assembly_Open_Access_Policy.pdf

577 http://osc.hul.harvard.edu/hbspolicy

578 http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_facpub/Open_Access_Policy_Final_02252010.pdf

579 http://library.duke.edu/openaccess/duke-openaccess-policy.html

580 https://mx2.arl.org/Lists/SPARC-OAForum/Message/5436.html

581 http://osc.hul.harvard.edu/hdspolicy

582 http://library.manoa.hawaii.edu/about/scholcom/oaatuhm.html

583 http://scholcomm.columbia.edu/open-access/open-access-policies/
lamont-doherty-earth-observatory-open-access-policy/

584 http://www.eifl.net/news/strathmore-university-open-access-policy-keny

585 http://guides.main.library.emory.edu/content.php?pid=43389&sid=2144393

586 http://osc.hul.harvard.edu/hgsdpolicy

587 http://scholcomm.columbia.edu/open-access/open-access-policies/
columbia-university-libraries-information-services-open-access-policy/

588 http://www.princeton.edu/dof/policies/publ/fac/open-access-policy/

589 http://www.hope.edu/admin/provost/fachandbook/Obligations/C6-C9/C9.html

590 http://nile.lub.lu.se/ojs/index.php/sciecominfo/article/view/5425/4751

591 http://www.bifrost.is/islenska/um-haskolann/stefna-og-hlutverk/
opinn-adgangur/

592 http://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&ved=0C-
CIQFjAA&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.jkuat.ac.ke%2F%3Fwpdmact%3Dprocess%-
26did%3DNjguaG90bGluaw%3D%3D&ei=5nV4UNjMAY-M0QH4o4H4DQ&us-
g=AFQjCNGkNk5ceu_i5MW0zdbKxcLOrZVH-A&sig2=SPrJ8r5ZZ_wCa2HynZ5mnA

593 http://www.usu.edu/hr/files/uploads/535.pdf

594 http://www.lib.muohio.edu/news_and_notes/open-access-policy

595 http://www.library.ucsf.edu/help/scholpub/oapolicy

596 http://library.umassmed.edu/oa_policy

597 http://publications.mcgill.ca/reporter/2012/10/mcgill-librarians-an-
nounce-support-of-open-access-movement/

598 http://senate.rutgers.edu/RGPEConS1103onOpenAccessOctober2012.pdf

599 http://osc.hul.harvard.edu/hsphpolicy

600 http://library.gatech.edu/scdc/OA_policy_draft

601 http://www.arl.org/sparc/bm~doc/olinopenaccesspolicy_approved_112812.pdf

602 http://www.eifl.net/news/university-nairobi-open-access-policy

603 http://new.wellesley.edu/sites/default/files/assets/departments/provost/
files/openaccesspolicy2.13.13.pdf

604 http://openaccess.voices.wooster.edu/policy/

605 https://www.amherst.edu/library/about/policies/openaccess

606 http://www.uri.edu/facsen/about/legislation/legislation_docu-
ments/2012-13/Bill_12-13-29.pdf

607 https://openarchive.stanford.edu/content/gse-student-open-archive-motion

608 http://cdss.library.oregonstate.edu/open-access

609 http://osc.universityofcalifornia.edu/openaccesspolicy/

610 http://www.opensocietyfoundations.org/openaccess/boai-10-recommendations

611 http://www.coar-repositories.org/news-media/sustainable-practic-es-for-populating-repositories-report-published/

612 http://www.ala.org/alcts/sites/ala.org.alcts/files/content/resources/papers/ir_ch05_.pdf

613 http://www.openscholarship.org/jcms/c_6217/formulating-an-institution-al-open-access-policy

614 http://openaccess.eprints.org/index.php?/archives/864-.html

615 http://eprints.soton.ac.uk/267298/

616 http://osc.hul.harvard.edu/modelpolicy

617 http://www.openoasis.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=arti-cle&id=145&Itemid=298

618 http://projecto.rcaap.pt/index.php/lang-pt/consultar-recursos-de-apoio/remository?func=fileinfo&id=336

619 http://eprints.soton.ac.uk/268511 /

620 http://blogs.law.harvard.edu/pamphlet/category/scholarly-communication/

621 http://www.arl.org/sparc/bm˜doc/sparc_boycott_next_steps.pdf

622 http://www.arl.org/sparc/advocacy/campus/

623 http://nrs.harvard.edu/urn-3:HUL.InstRepos:4322589

624 http://nrs.harvard.edu/urn-3:HUL.InstRepos:4317659

625 http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0021 /002158/215863e.pdf

626 http://www.arl.org/sparc/about/COAPI/the-coalition-of-open-access-poli-cy-institutions-c.shtml

627 http://roarmap.eprints.org/

628 http://oad.simmons.edu/oadwiki/Unanimous_faculty_votes

629 http://oad.simmons.edu/

630 http://oad.simmons.edu/oadwiki/OA_tracking_project

631 http://tagteam.harvard.edu/hubs/3/tag/oa.best_practices

632 http://tagteam.harvard.edu/hubs/3/tag/oa.case.policies.universities

633 http://tagteam.harvard.edu/hubs/3/tag/oa.case.repositories

634 http://tagteam.harvard.edu/hubs/3/tag/oa.deposits

635 http://tagteam.harvard.edu/hubs/3/tag/oa.ir

636 http://tagteam.harvard.edu/hubs/3/tag/oa.mandates

637 http://tagteam.harvard.edu/hubs/3/tag/oa.policies