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Introduction

opeNWorks is one of the Jisc Open Access (OA) Good Practice Pathfinder projects running from 2014 to 2016. In the second year of the project the opeNWorks team addressed two areas of interest identified by Jisc:

1. Approaches to deposit,
2. Benchmarking OA support services.

The first part of this report focuses on ‘Approaches to deposit’. It outlines work undertaken between October 2015 and March 2016 to investigate and evaluate deposit workflows in place at UK higher education institutions (HEIs) to support compliance with the Open Access (OA) policy launched by the Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE) in April 2016. Part two reports on work carried out on benchmarking OA support services.

Part 1: Approaches to Deposit

The investigation sought to understand the role of authors, departmental administrators and OA and Institutional Repository (IR) support staff within workflows, the rationale for the workflow adopted, including pros and cons, and to estimate the indicative cost to institutions of the preferred model. During the study it became clear that institutional context and position on this issue are the key factors in determining the model adopted.

This section comprises a summary of findings, an outline of the study and analysis.

Summary

1. Deposit models vary according to how publication records are added to institutional repositories and the person responsible for attaching manuscripts.

2. A high number of study participants believed that the deposit model in place at their institution at 1st April 2016 would not guarantee full compliance with the HEFCE REF OA policy.

3. Many institutions expect their current model to evolve, either due to the adoption of CRIS systems, the creation of new staff roles or the need to meet HEFCE’s deposit on acceptance requirement from 1st April 2017.

4. Deposit approaches in place tend not to have been created to meet the requirements of the HEFCE REF OA policy. Where institutions had an existing deposit workflow with which academic staff engaged this model has continued, with minor modification to support deposit on acceptance.

5. Despite HEFCE\(^1\) placing responsibility for deposit on authors themselves, very few institutions have adopted a deposit model relying solely on authors to create or claim publication records and deposit their manuscript. Of the institutions that encourage or require authors to deposit manuscripts, only one relies on authors to set embargo periods.

\(^1\) FAQ 3.1 - http://www.hefce.ac.uk/rsrch/oa/FAQ/
6. A fully-mediated deposit model supported by OA/IR staff is in place both at large, research-intensive universities and smaller institutions.

7. A mixed deposit model, in which manuscripts may be deposited by a range of staff (author, administrative support in department, OA/IR support), is popular across institutions of all sizes.

8. No institution has adopted a deposit model relying only on department-level administrative support to create publication records and deposit papers. However, at a small number of institutions this model has been adopted by individual departments.

9. There is no consensus on the ‘right’ deposit model.

10. There is no consensus on the time taken per paper in each model. However, most institutions agree that it takes less than twenty minutes to process ‘problem-free’ papers. The key determinants in the cost to institutions of adopting a given model are the number of research papers produced annually and the number and grade of staffing resource dedicated to this work.

**The Study**

Data was gathered during the study through interviews and a survey. Representatives from six UK HEIs were interviewed:

- Imperial College
- Queen Mary University, London
- University of Sheffield
- Liverpool John Moores University
- University of Sussex
- Manchester Metropolitan University

The study aimed to provide case studies that would be representative of a wide range of institutions. Case study participants were invited based on their institution’s annual research output, according to SciVal data. A survey was carried out to gather evidence from a wider group. Thirty three institutions completed the survey. Participants were asked to provide contextual information, including:

- Number of research papers produced annually
- Number of research staff and research students
- Repository system (Case studies only)

---

2 See Appendix 1 for interview question template
3 http://man.ac.uk/qO1kCz
4 http://man.ac.uk/0kOmmN
5 http://man.ac.uk/YRmuy8
6 http://man.ac.uk/0xZHrw
7 http://man.ac.uk/5PAdbs
8 http://man.ac.uk/s48S2t
9 See Appendix 2 for survey question template
10 See Appendix 3 for a list of survey respondents
• OA governance structure (Case studies only)
• Number and grade level of OA support staff

Specific details of the approach to depositing papers were also gathered, including the time taken to make a ‘problem-free’ paper compliant with the HEFCE REF OA policy.

**Background**

In considering the workflow models the study made the following assumptions:

a) Workflows would include a number of stages in the process of achieving compliance with the HEFCE REF OA policy:
   1. Publication record created and paper deposited
   2. Publication record and deposited paper verified
   3. Publication record enhanced and embargo date set

b) Tasks would be carried out by one or more of three groupings:
   1. Author
   2. Departmental administrators
   3. Institutional OA support staff

Case study participants were asked to describe the workflow in place at their institution. Survey participants were asked to select the options within three workflow stages which best described the workflow at their institution.

**Analysis**

All but two of the institutions involved in the study agreed that there are three stages to the deposit workflow. However, approaches vary between institutions and there is currently no single dominant model. There is no clear correlation between workflow models and the number of research papers produced annually by institutions.

One institution that did not agree described a two stage workflow which does not include verification of publication data or the deposited manuscript. This institution, which produces more than 1000 research papers annually, does not currently have any staff dedicated to OA support but recognises that their approach is suitable only for the first year of the HEFCE policy –

“We are working to comply with the HEFCE policy as it stands now, ie, on publication and using the time from now until April 2017 to investigate how we can support deposit on acceptance”.

The other institution does not carry out checks for publication of accepted papers but sets embargo dates when depositing papers.
**Stage One**

Thirteen different Stage One deposit workflows were identified\(^{11}\). These are made up of varying combinations of workflow tasks and levels of mediated support.

The most common approaches involve the creation of publication records and deposit of the paper by the author only (7 institutions) or by the author, their delegate or an administrator acting on behalf of the department (8). An equal number of institutions (5) operate workflows in which authors or their delegates create records and deposit papers, and in which publications are submitted to OA/IR support staff who then create records and carry out the deposit.

A number of institutions emphasised that their workflow aims to minimise administration for authors. This is evident in the minimal metadata required of authors when creating publication records: journal name (34), article title (33), author list (31), acceptance date (27). Grant acknowledgements are required metadata at sixteen institutions, whilst a handful of institutions require other information, eg, peer review status and ISSN. Metadata fields are rarely mandatory and institutions noted that mandating acceptance date can be problematic, eg, two institutions reported that authors have provided the publication date rather than the acceptance date within their workflows.

Institutions generally have an approved workflow in place but in some institutions individual departments have opted out of the centralised model. One survey respondent stated that their preferred model is “author self-deposit, with mixed approach in mediation in some schools and central mediation as backup”. However, case study participants with experience of a mixed model described the difficulty this poses for OA/IR support staff in communicating the HEFCE OA REF policy to their researchers.

The study has been unable to determine how institutions operating the ‘author only’ model know that this is happening in practice. One case study participant explained that this model is preferred at their institution because “it’s the author who has the manuscript” but then described how some departments have adopted a departmental-mediated approach.

The institution with no staff dedicated to OA support relies on the CRIS harvesting publication records during Stage One of their workflow – “Symplectic harvests records and then author deposits”.

**Stage Two**

Most institutions check and enhance publication metadata and verify that the version of a paper submitted can be deposited. The survey has not identified a consistent approach on setting embargo periods. A high number of survey respondents (27) stated that they set embargo periods when checking deposits and it seems that only a few institutions set an indefinite embargo at this stage.

A range of other tasks are carried out by study participants at this stage:

- Apply house style to publication records (22)
- Monitor publication of accepted papers (25)

\(^{11}\) See Appendix 4
• Check funder acknowledgements on accepted papers (21)
• Make publication records open (25)
• Record/report policy exceptions (19)

A small number of institutions ask authors to enhance their publication records.

**Stage Three**
High levels of mediated support were identified at this stage. Publication records are updated by OA/IR support staff only at 24 institutions and at other institutions by OA/IR support staff plus authors (7), delegates (2) or delegates and department-level administrators (2). Embargo periods are set by OA/IR staff at 33 institutions and by authors at 2 institutions. Three institutions do not set embargo periods at this stage, suggesting that their embargoes are set prior to publication.

A number of institutions indicated that their workflows are currently under review with increased mediated support likely to be introduced in future –

“We may consider mediated deposit, depending on availability of staff time”.

“we are looking to change this workflow to a different process where the institutional repository team do an almost complete mediated service”.

Another institution described a rationale which ensures their workflow is manageable –

“Some records may not be fully updated provided DOI is present as revisiting to add page numbers etc is resource intensive”.

Further to the three stages of deposit described, a number of institutions include a range of other tasks:

• Option to request APC payment (12)
• Addition of publisher statement on cover sheet or in metadata (10)
• Addition of standard statement on cover sheet or in metadata (8)
• Converting documents to PDF (1)
• Checking acceptance letters (1)

Compliance reporting is an element of the deposit workflows of 23 participants, with other institutions mostly preparing to introduce this when systems are upgraded. Reports are provided to a range of stakeholders, including institutional REF teams and Unit of Assessment leads (16), senior institutional OA staff (14), Directors of Research (14), central research offices (12) and faculty administrators (7).

**Resources**

**Staffing**
The number of FTE posts and the number of staff supporting deposit workflows varies. As noted previously, one institution currently has no dedicated staffing resource for OA support. Of the four institutions that reported less than 1.0 FTE post, two produce less than 500 research outputs annually and two do not know the annual research output.
The highest number of institutions (13) has between one and two FTE posts support their deposit workflow. Most institutions within this category produce between 750 and 1000 research papers annually. However, the institution reporting the lowest annual research output (100 - 250 papers) has 1.0 FTE post supporting the deposit workflow. Three institutions reporting an annual output exceeding 1000 papers fall within this category with FTE posts averaging 1.5.

Higher numbers of FTE posts reported are fairly even and in most cases the number increases in line with the annual research output of institutions:

- Between two and three posts (6)
- Between three and four posts (6)
- Between four and five posts (4)
- Between five and six posts (4)

Two institutions with FTE posts of between four and five produce fewer than 2000 research papers annually. One institution with 3.5 FTE posts produces fewer than 2500 papers annually. However, it is likely that posts include other tasks and responsibilities so it is difficult to determine exact support requirements per workflow.

The study found some variation in the grade level of staff supporting the deposit workflow. This was £20,000–£30,000pa for the majority of participants. Ten institutions reported that workflow tasks are carried out by staff on grades exceeding £30,000pa, but at all except one institution this reflected a range of graded staff making up the repository/OA team.

A high number of institutions (23) reported that OA/IR support roles are permanent posts. Other institutions described temporary roles and fixed term contracts.

**Workflow costs**

The study estimated the cost of deposit workflows for case study participants, based on the staff involved, the time taken to carry out the workflow tasks and the number of research papers produced annually. Although estimated times vary most institutions suggested that the time taken to make a ‘problem-free’ paper compliant with HEFCE’s policy is twenty minutes or less. Only five institutions suggested a time higher than twenty five minutes per paper. Case study participants agreed that approximately 80% of papers are likely to be ‘problem-free’, requiring no follow-up correspondence with author or publisher, but two survey participants disagreed – “not many of them are problem-free”.


Table 1: Estimated cost of workflows in place at case study institutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Research paper output (pa)</th>
<th>Problem-free paper time in minutes</th>
<th>Problem-free paper cost</th>
<th>Problematic paper time in minutes</th>
<th>Problematic paper cost</th>
<th>Estimated total cost (pa)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Imperial College</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>£3.65</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>£5.65</td>
<td>£40,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Sheffield</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>£7.84</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>£12.25</td>
<td>£52,332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queen Mary University of London</td>
<td>2,700</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>£3.25</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>£4.85</td>
<td>£9,639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liverpool John Moores University</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>£6.05</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>£10.45</td>
<td>£10,395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Sussex</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>£4.23</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>£5.71</td>
<td>£7,038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manchester Metropolitan University</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>£7.58</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>£12.41</td>
<td>£6,810</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the indicative costs estimated for case study participants, the highest cost calculated was for the University of Sheffield, and not the institution producing the most research papers annually. This is due to the estimated time taken to process papers in Sheffield’s new workflow. It is noticeable that the estimated cost of the model adopted at Liverpool John Moores University (LJMU) exceeds that of Queen Mary, University of London (QMUL), despite QMUL producing almost double the annual research output. This is due to the grade of staff currently carrying out the deposit workflow. Manchester Metropolitan University’s estimated cost appears high in relation to the number of papers produced annually. This is believed to be due to staff not processing papers regularly and not developing in-depth knowledge which can increase efficiency.

Although the cost elements vary between institutions, it is evident that supporting the HEFCE OA policy has a financial impact on institutions.

**Effectiveness**

Almost half of study participants (16) are not confident that their workflow will achieve compliance with the HEFCE policy. Suggestions for improving workflows to increase compliance ranged from local solutions, eg, more training for academic staff –

“Improved training/communication with researchers will be key to success on this”,

to global system changes, eg, more data being provided by publishers at acceptance –
“All data available from acceptance from publishers with as many unique identifiers as possible, including ORCIDs”.

A number of institutions are implementing new systems, eg, CRIS or repository plug-ins, which are expected to increase workflow effectiveness. However, the vulnerability of support services was also highlighted –

“Our workflow processes are fine at the moment but if we get 100% of papers we will need a lot more staff”,

“We need more staff time. We only meet requirements by going beyond our remit”.

It is clear that workflows in place in the period prior to the launch of the HEFCE policy will undergo regular review as institutions monitor compliance levels and/or engagement levels increase. A number of institutions also noted that external developments external are also likely to impact on current workflows, eg, Jisc Publications Router\textsuperscript{12} and the UK Scholarly Communication Policy\textsuperscript{13}.

### Part 2: Benchmarking Open Access Support Services

The investigation focused on three institutions with well-established Open Access (OA) support services, the universities of Cambridge, Manchester and Salford. Information was collected during informal interviews.

**Background**

This study assumed that resource allocation for OA support services was based on two key factors, the number of research outputs and the level of OA funding available at institutions.

Cambridge and Manchester are large research intensive universities. Cambridge produces over 9000 research papers annually, and Manchester produces approximately 5000. Both institutions receive OA block grants from the UK Research Councils (RCUK) and from the Charity Open Access Fund (COAF). The RCUK block grants allocated to both institutions in 2015-16 exceeded £1m and the policy compliance target was more than 700 papers. Neither university currently has an institutional OA fund. Manchester will have a fund from August 2016 but Cambridge highlighted the difficulty of obtaining an institutional fund due to the collegiate nature of the University and the lack of centralised finance.

Salford produces approximately 600 research papers annually and receives a small block grant from RCUK (£63,000 in 2015-16). The grant has been underspent in previous years because researchers awarded RCUK grants prior to 2012 are no longer employed by Salford. The University has had an

\textsuperscript{12} https://pubrouter.jisc.ac.uk/

institutional OA fund for the past three years and predicts that a £30,000 fund is sufficient to meet demand within a year.

Open Access Support Services

Staffing Resource

Open Access support services are provided by Scholarly Communication teams at all three institutions. The teams at Cambridge and Manchester comprise seven posts. The Salford team is made up of three posts. The grading of staff within these teams is slightly higher at Cambridge and Manchester than at Salford.

Table 2: Staffing levels and grades

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cambridge</th>
<th>Manchester</th>
<th>Salford</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.0 FTE Manager(^a)</td>
<td>1.0 FTE Manager(^a)</td>
<td>0.6 FTE Manager(^b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0 FTE OA Research Advisors(^b)</td>
<td>2.0 FTE Scholarly Communication Librarians(^b)</td>
<td>0.5 FTE Repository Officer(^c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0 FTE Repository Manager(^b)</td>
<td>4.0 FTE Research Support Assistants(^c)</td>
<td>0.5 FTE Repository Assistant(^d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0 FTE Repository Assistants(^d)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Managerial level, starting salary approximately £38,000; \(^b\) Professional level, starting salary approximately £30,000; \(^c\) Paraprofessional level, starting salary approximately £25,000; \(^d\) Senior clerical level, starting salary approximately £22,000

All three institutions have created new posts to provide OA support. Cambridge’s team was launched in 2014 and is made up mostly of fixed-term posts. These are funded from the Library budget and RCUK funding. Following a restructure in 2012 which created a Research Services division, Manchester created two extra Research Support Assistant roles, one in 2013 and a second in 2014. These are both fixed-term and funded from the RCUK OA block grant. Salford created the Scholarly Communications manager post in 2014 and the Repository Assistant role in 2015. The Assistant post is temporary and funded from the RCUK OA block grant. All other posts are permanent.

Cambridge believe that current staffing levels are adequate for handling current deposit levels (50% of Cambridge’s total research output) but that extra Repository Assistants would be needed in order to process 100% of papers and continue to fulfil advocacy and reporting requirements.

At Manchester staff in other teams also have a role in OA support, eg, Purchasing, Finance and Marketing teams.

Responsibilities

Although Open Access provides the core responsibilities of each of the service teams a number of the posts have other areas of responsibility. Cambridge’s Repository Manager post includes responsibility for Research Data Management. Librarians at Manchester are responsible for institutional ORCID adoption, advocating the use of Altmetrics and the Electronic Thesis service.
OA support tasks include the following:

- Policy interpretation assistance
- Designing workflows
- Publication advice
- OA advocacy (presentations, website, guidance materials)
- Funder reports
- Faculty/department-level reports
- Monitoring compliance
- Processing article processing charge (APC) requests (liaising with authors, publishers, finance colleagues)
- Depositing manuscripts
- Metadata curation
- Checking OA status of papers

Each institution carries out these tasks but the extent of mediated support varies. Cambridge and Manchester have workflows in place that keep author input into the OA process to a minimum. Both institutions ask authors to provide the OA team with a copy of the Author Accepted Manuscript and will then carry out most administrative tasks on behalf of the author to make a paper Gold or Green OA. Cambridge is working on automating systems to reduce manual deposit work and report that checking publications and compliance is increasingly onerous. Salford also aim to keep author administration to a minimum but, unlike Cambridge and Manchester, do require authors to deposit papers in the repository.

**Skillset**

Cambridge believe that researcher experience is critical to engaging academic staff with OA and recruited researchers to the OA Research Advisor posts. Other relevant experience and skills mentioned by Cambridge, Manchester or Salford include the following:

- Problem-solving skills
- Influencing skills
- Excellent interpersonal skills, including relationship-building and empathy with researchers
- Contextual awareness, eg, scholarly communication landscape
- Excellent communication skills
- Data analysis skills
- Metadata skills
- Technical know-how, eg, to support repository or identify programmatic solutions
- Website skills

All three institutions agreed that ‘attitude’ was the key requirement, by which they meant presenting a bolder image than library staff are traditionally known for, and an ability to speak authoritatively with researchers.
Appendix 1

Template for ‘Approaches to Deposit’ case studies

1. Type of institution
2. Number of research staff
3. Number of research papers per year
4. Repository software
5. Who manages repository?
6. Number and grade of staff in repository team
7. Other repository support?
8. Governance of repository and OA policy implementation
9. Institutional OA policy
10. Deposit workflow
11. Role of support staff in deposit workflow
12. Rationale for deposit workflow
13. Tested prior to implementation?
14. Monitoring and reporting plans
15. Success criteria for approach
16. Estimated cost to institution
17. Communication and advocacy for approach
Appendix 2

Approaches to Deposit workflow survey

The opeNWorks project is seeking information about the deposit workflows in place to support institutional compliance with the HEFCE/REF OA policy.

Key to terminology:

Delegate is used in the survey to describe a PA or other individual who acts on behalf of an individual researcher.

School/department administrators in this context are roles (specially created or existing roles) that have responsibility for carrying out OA deposits for a whole school or department.

1) This question is about the quantity of papers your deposit workflow needs to accommodate.

   a. How many research papers does your institution produce each year that will be affected by the HEFCE/REF OA policy?
      • 100-250
      • 250-500
      • 500-750
      • 750-1000
      • More than 1000
      • Don’t know

   b. If you have selected a figure, is this an estimate?
      • Yes
      • No

2) This question is about the deposit workflow at your institution. Please select all the elements that best describe the deposit workflow you have in place to meet the HEFCE/REF OA requirements.

   a. Stage 1.
      • Author creates publication record and deposits their manuscript
      • Delegate creates publication record and deposits their manuscript on behalf of individual author
      • School/Departmental administrators create publication records and deposit manuscripts on behalf of all authors within the School/Department
      • Author submits publication metadata and manuscript to institutional Open Access/repository team which creates publication record and deposits manuscript
• Institutional OA/repository support staff harvest records from other repositories (if so, which repositories?)
• Other (please describe)
• Any other comments

b. Stage 2.
• OA/repository support staff check accuracy of publication metadata
• OA/repository support staff enhance publication metadata
• OA/repository support staff request that submitting author enhances publication metadata
• OA/repository support staff ensure publication metadata is displayed in line with internal house style
• OA/repository support staff confirm submitted manuscript can be deposited
• OA/repository support staff set indefinite embargo unless paper is Gold OA
• OA/repository support staff check and set embargo period for all papers
• OA/repository support staff check and set embargo period only if publication date is known
• OA/repository support staff check if paper is subject to OA policies of other funders and ensure compliance with all policies
• OA/repository support staff make all publication records open
• OA/repository support staff make publication record open only if paper has been published
• OA/repository support staff report publications that do not meet HEFCE/REF policy requirements as exceptions as appropriate
• OA/repository support staff set up publication alerts for accepted papers
• OA/repository support staff create internal mechanism to monitor publication of accepted papers
• Other (please describe)
• Any other comments

c. Stage 3.
• On publication, author updates metadata
• On publication, author’s delegate updates metadata
• On publication, School/Departmental administrator updates metadata
• On publication, OA/repository support staff update metadata
• On publication, author sets embargo period
• On publication, author’s delegate sets embargo period
• On publication, School/Departmental administrator sets embargo period
• On publication, OA/repository support staff set embargo period
• On publication, OA/repository support staff make publication record open for all papers
• On publication, OA/repository support staff make publication record open for papers subject to pre-publication metadata embargo
• Other (please describe)
• Any other comments
3) This question is about what is required by authors and their delegates in the deposit workflow.

What metadata do you require authors to provide when creating a publication record in your deposit workflow?
- Author list
- Article title
- Journal name
- Acceptance date
- Publisher
- Publication date (if known)
- DOI (if known)
- Grant acknowledgements
- Other
- Any other comments

4) This question is about tasks in the workflow beyond validation of deposits.

Does your workflow include any of the following:
- Addition of publication coversheet including statement on Creative Commons licence
- Addition of publication coversheet including statement required by publisher
- Addition of publication coversheet including standard statement based on statements required by publishers
- Option to obtain payment of APC
  - If yes, does the author request Gold OA? Y/N
  - If yes, do OA/repository support staff request Gold OA for eligible papers? Y/N
- Anything else
- Any other comments

5) This question is about compliance reporting in the deposit workflow.

a) Does your workflow include creation of compliance reports?
- Yes
- No

b) If yes, who do you produce the reports for?
- OA/repository support staff/manager
- Institutional research office
- Institutional REF team
- Faculty senior research staff/senior staff with OA responsibility
- Faculty research administrators
- School/Department Research Directors
- School/Department research administrators
- Other
• Any other comments

6) This question is about the evaluation of your deposit workflow.

Are you monitoring the effectiveness of your workflow?
• Yes
• No

7) This question is about the OA/repository support team directly involved in the deposit workflow.

a) How many FTE posts do you have to support the deposit workflow? Please provide your answer in Arabic numbers.

b) How many staff members make up the number of FTE posts? Please provide your answer in Arabic numbers.

8) This question is about the grade of staff directly involved in supporting the deposit workflow.

a) Please select the pay band of staff working on validating publication records.
   • Up to £20,000 pa
   • Up to £25,000 pa
   • Up to £30,000 pa
   • More than £30,000 pa

b) Are staff working on validating publication records employed on permanent contracts?
   • Yes
   • No
   • Any other comments

9) This question is about the time taken to make a problem-free paper deposited compliant with the HEFCE/REF OA policy.

How many minutes does it take to manage a standard, problem-free paper in your workflow so that it complies with the HEFCE/REF OA policy?

10) This question is about the effectiveness of your deposit workflow.
Are you confident that your workflow can achieve institutional compliance with the HEFCE/REF OA policy?
• Yes
• No – If no, what will you do to improve the compliance level?
## Appendix 3

### Approaches to Deposit workflow survey respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bangor University</td>
<td>University of Cambridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bath Spa University</td>
<td>University of Central Lancashire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardiff University</td>
<td>University of Chester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heythrop College, University of London</td>
<td>University of Glasgow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keele University</td>
<td>University of Hertfordshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London South Bank University</td>
<td>University of Hull</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newcastle University</td>
<td>University of Leeds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newman University</td>
<td>University of Liverpool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plymouth University</td>
<td>University of Manchester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queen’s University Belfast</td>
<td>University of Oxford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Holloway, University of London</td>
<td>University of Southampton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University College London</td>
<td>University of St Andrews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Bath</td>
<td>University of Surrey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Birmingham</td>
<td>University of the West of England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Worcester</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 4

### Stage One Deposit Workflows

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage One workflow description</th>
<th>Number of institutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Publication record created and paper deposited by author, delegate or School-level administrator(s)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publication record created and paper deposited by author</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author submits publication details and paper to OA/IR team who create publication record and deposit paper</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publication record created and paper deposited by author or delegate</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publication record created and paper deposited by author + Publication records harvested and paper deposited by author</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publication record created and paper deposited by author, delegate or School-level administrator(s) + Publication records harvested and paper deposited by author</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publication record created and paper deposited by author + Author submits publication details and paper to OA/IR team who create publication record and deposit paper</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publication record created and paper deposited by author, delegate or School-level administrator(s) + Author submits publication details and paper to OA/IR team who create publication record and deposit paper + Publication records harvested and paper deposited by author</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publication record created and paper deposited by author, delegate or School-level administrator(s) + Author submits publication details and paper to OA/IR team who create publication record and deposit paper</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publication record created and paper deposited by author, delegate or School-level administrator(s) + Publication records imported from ArXiv and paper deposited by author</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publication record created and paper deposited by author or delegate + Author or delegate submits publication details and paper or repository link to OA/IR team who create publication record and deposit paper</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publication records are harvested by Symplectic and author deposits paper</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>