



**University of St Andrews**  
*Scotland's first university*

600 YEARS  
1413 – 2013

The University of St Andrews is a charity registered in Scotland, No: SC013532

**Allocation of additional investment from the  
Department of Business, Innovation & Skills  
(BIS) in Open Access**

**Report to Research Councils UK from the  
University of St Andrews**



## The University of St Andrews was allocated £137,000 additional investment funding.

OA-Related Activity	Expenditure (to nearest £10k)
APCs	58,000
OA subscriptions	49,000
Staff costs (including policy/training/awareness raising)	27,000
Systems development/IT infrastructure	0
Other	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>£134,000</b>

Please consult individual sections to see our original BIS plan allocation compared to actual spend.

## Article Processing Charge (APC) transactions

	Allocation in BIS plan	Actual spend
APCs	£50,000	£58,647

Transaction type	Spend	Count
<b>New APCs</b>	£43,348	41 articles
<b>Retrospective APCs</b>	£15,032	15 articles
<b>Miscellaneous charges</b>	£267	
<b>Total</b>	<b>£58,647</b>	<b>56 articles</b>

APCs (£58,380) by publisher			
T&F	£8750	Association for Research in Vision and Ophthalmology	£1980
Geological Society of America	£7382	Nature Publishing Group	£1922
PLOS	£7403	Portland Press	£1800
OUP	£5904	Royal Society	£1260
Springer	£4394	Genetics Society of America	£1065
Elsevier	£3490	Hindawi	£1014
Cambridge University Press	£2034	American Chemical Society	£995
APA	£2027	(Other)	£6,960

Our goal was to devise a mixed approach to allow us to include all disciplines and a wide variety of research outputs. We had requests for funding from 13 of our 18 Schools. We dealt with over 50 different publishers in response to researcher demand. We reviewed spending at regular intervals and rolled unspent allocations into APCs to meet need. We recorded an average APC cost of £1,394.

We were able to include publications from our target groups of new REF publications and retrospective APCs. We targeted both RCUK funded and non RCUK funded researchers and successfully included publications from both groups. We also provided APCs to some early career researchers.

We explored new workflows and processes to manage a publication fund and to monitor uptake as well as gathering statistics to inform future plans, for example for staffing and technical requirements.

The funding allowed us to work closely with Directors of Research with regard to open access publication choices, APC costs and prioritisation of funds. This has seeded ideas and methods for future OA fund allocation and processes.

We clearly demonstrated the need for efficient processes and technical systems to support the recording and reporting of financial transactions linked to effective recording of metadata for publications and also linked to funding information. St Andrews has a PURE CRIS and a DSpace repository but these systems need further development to integrate financial data and transactions and to incorporate publisher metadata for APCs and publications. We decided to participate in the JISC APC trial as an outcome of our experience in managing a publication fund.

## Spending on OA subscriptions

	Allocation in BIS plan	Actual spend
OA subscriptions, memberships, related APCs and new OA models	£40,000	£48,782

Transaction type	Spend	Count
<b>Membership (OA subscription)</b>	£6,382	4 publishers
<b>Prepay deposit</b>	£42,400 (15k remaining 'unspent*' July 2013)	3 publishers/18 articles to July 2013
<b>Total</b>	£48,782	

\*Funds remaining in publisher deposit accounts, now being used for RCUK-funded outputs

Memberships (£6382)		Prepay deals (£42,400)	
Royal Society Publishing	£2100	Wiley	£30,000
PLOS	£1305	BMC	£10,000
Nucleic Acids Research (OUP)	£2875	SAGE	£2400
American Chemical Society	£100		

We took advantage of institutional memberships offered by publishers including Wiley, BMC and SAGE pre-pay schemes, and discount deals with PLoS, Royal Society and OUP. We took care to consult with Academic Schools to match these schemes to institutional publishing preferences and to look for the most cost effective deals and discounts. We also considered ease of use for authors and the timeliness of transactions.

We rolled the original allocation of £2k for new OA fee models into APCs and membership schemes which represented ‘new business models’ and opportunities. We participated in the RSC ‘Gold for Gold’ scheme and individual society memberships where discounted fees are available due to Library subscriptions.

## Technical infrastructure

	Allocation	Actual spend
Technical infrastructure	£15,000	£0

Zero expenditure was caused primarily by lack of resource and timing issues. The BIS trial took place at the time when our PURE CRIS and Institutional Repository suppliers were focussed on the REF and could not easily provide extra functionality within our development timescale and funding period.

We were able to provide technical specifications to vendors, for example to enhance the PURE public portal with research funding information and to provide a more user friendly and intuitive display with social networking elements. We have retained a small sum £2,146 to put towards the cost.

## Staffing (including policy/training/awareness raising)

	Allocation	Actual spend
Staffing	£26,000	£27,425

The provision of the BIS money led to a greatly increased demand for user support. The workload stretched our existing staffing resource to the limit. We recruited a Repository Support Officer. This 12-month ft staff post runs until June 2014. The post acts as a bridge between the pump priming phase and the RCUK block grant. It builds on the work of existing repository staff, who prioritised advocacy, training and awareness work during the BIS grant period.

Key staffing activities and lessons learned included:

- We succeeded in using every OA transaction and enquiry as an opportunity for personal engagement with academics. This communication with researchers at every level created a fertile environment for open access advocacy and is a key strategy in supporting our academic authors in a transition to OA publishing.
- We contacted all Schools to offer liaison support and achieved a 60% success rate in arranging visits and training. We met with Directors of Research, gave presentations to School Research meetings and Away Days. We gave generic open access workshops as part of our staff and postgraduate institutional development programmes. We found a clear correlation between visits to a School and subsequent enquiries from researchers in that School about enabling open access publication.
- We enhanced information about open access on our institutional webpages and developed documentation about available funding and the routes to obtain it. This is now core

information on webpages and will expand as funding streams develop. Documentation about “gold” and “green” open access publication was refined to meet user demand and the need for concise definitions and easy to understand terminology. We perceived a growing need for institution wide and repeat events to sustain our advocacy work.

- We raised the profile of our OA blog, and publicised a generic open-access-support email contact for enquiries. [Approximately 200 OA support emails were handled in Jan-May 2013]
- We spent a significant amount of time on supporting Green Open Access, through publisher policy checks, and by contacting publishers for permissions. We saw a 100% increase in the deposit of full text new items into Research@StAndrews:FullText deposited via Pure (Jan – May 2013 = 187 items) compared to the same period in 2012.
- Consultation as part of our advocacy programme demonstrated a need for an institutional lead on open access policies. This has resulted in the creation of an Open Access Steering Group and the initial drafting of an institutional open access policy and accompanying guidance.