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Background: Wits Commitment to OA

2003-ETD
2005-WIREDSpace
2006-HP Digital Repository

Wits OA

WIREDSpace policy, 2008
Digitization Policy, 2010
Signing of Berlin Declaration on OA, 2012
Proposal on Funding APCs¹, 2013
Hosting OA seminars

Draft OA Policy, 2016-

1. Article processing charges
WIREDSpace OA Content & Usage

![Graph showing WiredSpace - Items and Page Views from 2012 to 2016. The graph indicates a steady increase in both items and page views across the years.]
Factors influencing OA at Wits

• The staffing (i.e. numbers & competencies) of OA related functions has remained insufficient
• Depositing into the OA repository is largely voluntary and competes with other priorities facing researchers
• Systems and budgets for supporting APCs
• Commitment to curating, openly sharing & showcasing Wits research outputs and holdings.
• The unsustainability of the journal subscription model

**NB:** In light of these factors, it has become evident that an overarching OA policy guideline is needed.
OA Draft Policy

- Policy drafting group (with inputs from various stakeholders):
  - Sponsor: DVC Research & Postgraduate Affairs
  - University Librarian
  - Scholarly Communications Librarian
  - Director: Research
  - Director: Wits Enterprise
  - Legal Advisor: Research Office
  - Legal Advisor: Wits Legal Office
  - Data Services Librarian
  - Manager: Library Systems and Digital Initiatives
  - Project Manager: Wits Press

- What is covered?
  - Purpose
  - Scope
  - Roles and responsibilities
  - Processes
Coverage

Purpose
• To ensure that Wits peer-reviewed research, where appropriate, be made accessible openly, globally, and as soon as possible by depositing (self-archiving) it in the Wits IR (Green OA), and/or publishing it in an open access journal (Gold OA).

Scope
• Applies to all academic and research staff, students and professional and administrative staff
• Peer-reviewed works & supplemental materials, e.g. books, book chapters, journal articles, conference papers, creative textual works, research reports, data sets, and ETDs.
Roles and responsibilities

• **The Library:** recommending policy, management & preservation of the research outputs; providing uploading support & training; negotiating journal subscription agreements that incorporate APCs.

• **University Research Office:** collecting academics’ accredited published versions of record (PDFs).

• **Academic and Professional Staff (Authors):** deciding on the best place to publish their works, although publication in accredited OA journals/publications is recommended; submitting unpublished accepted author manuscript version/postprint to the Faculty at the time of acceptance by the publisher

• **Postgraduate Students:** submitting final, corrected ETDs to the relevant Faculty Office for depositing in the Central Records Office and Wits IR.

• **Wits University Press:** submitting the final PDF of books by Wits authors for access & archiving, subject to copyright laws and contractual agreements with authors.
Processes

• **Accepted Author Manuscript Version/Postprint**: Once the author submits the postprint to the Faculty the Administrator then forwards it to the relevant Librarian for uploading to IR, in accordance with publishers’ copyright policies.

• **Published Version of Record (PDF)**: This version shall be submitted to the University Research Office which will then forward a copy to the Library for depositing in the IR in accordance with publishers’ copyright policies.

• **Electronic Theses/Dissertations**: On receipt of an ETD, the Library will catalogue and then load the full-text and its metadata onto the IR.

• **Supplemental material/Research Data**: Research data will be deposited with the Library, recorded and managed in accordance with Wits policies.
Review & Approval Structures

Senior Executive Team (SET)

University Research Committee (URC), 16 August, 2017

Senate eResearch Committee, 27 July 2017

Senate Library Committee (SLC), 31 July 2017

Senate
Where are We?

• Inputs from the Committees:
  – depositing processes should be streamlined
  – the processes and budgets for the payment of APCs should be explicit

• URC requested a second review to clarify APCs. The Research and Finance Offices & the Library are collecting OA data viz:
  – Two Faculties have submitted APC cost data, 2014-2016; submissions are awaited from three Faculties.
  – Top publishers of Wits research have been established¹ to inform inclusion of APCs in national database site licensing negotiations

1. Analysis by Maryna van den Heever, Manager: Library Research Support, 13 June 2017
Where are we? (cont.)

TOP 10 PUBLISHERS 2014-2016

- Elsevier
- Springer
- Routledge
- BioMed Central
- Public Library of Science
- Blackwell Publishing
- Taylor and Francis
- South African Medical Association
- Lippincott Williams and Wilkins
- Oxford University Press
What next?

- Update draft policy for submission to URC, SET and Senate
- Pilot APC budget & procedure proposal using historic costs data as baseline
- Contribute data on publishers of Wits research to assist with targeted discussions on inclusion of APCs in the anticipated national database site licensing model.
Thank you