



## **Table of Contents**

<b>I.</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>II.</b>	<b>Acknowledgements</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>III.</b>	<b>Definitions</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>IV.</b>	<b>About the Survey</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>V.</b>	<b>Demographics</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>VI.</b>	<b>Explanation of Berkeley's Numbers</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>VII.</b>	<b>Explanation of UCLA's Numbers</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>VIII.</b>	<b>Survey Results and Findings</b>	<b>7</b>
	<i>A. Journals and Publishers</i>	<i>7</i>
	<i>B. Hybrids versus Fully Open Access</i>	<i>9</i>
	<i>C. Financial Data</i>	<i>9</i>
	<i>D. Eligibility</i>	<i>11</i>
	<i>E. Campus Fund Administration Guidelines and Practices</i>	<i>12</i>
	<i>F. Relationship to Open Access Policy of the Academic Senate of the University of California</i>	<i>13</i>
<b>IX.</b>	<b>Campus Impact, Challenges, Opportunities</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>X.</b>	<b>Recommendations</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>XI.</b>	<b>Appendix: <a href="#">Assessment Report Webpage</a></b>	<b>15</b>
	<i>A. CLS-SAGI Charge</i>	
	<i>B. Campus Survey Form (Blank), April 2014</i>	
	<i>C. Campus Survey Results Summary, July 2014 (PDF and XLSX)</i>	
	<i>D. Links to UC Campus Open Access Fund Policies and Information Pages</i>	

## I. Introduction

In the fall of 2012 the UC Libraries Collection Development Committee, the Scholarly Communication Officers, and the California Digital Library established the UC Libraries Open Access Publishing Fund Pilot to encourage and support faculty who wanted to make their research freely and immediately available to the public. CDL provided each campus with \$10,000 in seed money, which was generally supplemented by local campus funds, for a pilot to run from October 2012 through March 2014.

To assess the impact of this eighteen-month pilot, CLS and SAG1 worked together to organize and document a set of questions to pose to the campuses and created the Open Access Publishing Fund Pilot Assessment Team to manage survey creation and administration and draft a report analyzing the survey's results and suggesting next steps. All campuses completed the survey by the middle of June 2014; the following pages describe the most informative results, with the complete results contained in the [appendix](#).

**Note about narrative describing local programs:** Since the end date of the pilot and the completion of the survey, several campuses have made additional expenditures from their local funds as well as local policy changes or decisions about whether/how to continue funding open access journal articles locally. Those changes are not reflected in this report, which focuses on the survey results themselves, but may be found on the campus programs' web pages, which are linked from the [appendix](#).

**Note about numbers:** There are some minor inconsistencies across the survey answers in the numbers that various campuses reported, resulting in tables whose totals should theoretically equal each other being unequal. The assessment team tried to obtain accurate numbers from each campus administrator to the best of its ability but notes that some inconsistencies remain. However, these minor errors do not change the basic pattern of the survey results, nor the conclusions and recommendations that can be drawn from them.

## II. Acknowledgements

The assessment team gratefully acknowledges the assistance of the following local administrators of the Open Access Publishing Fund Pilot:

- Margaret Phillips, UC Berkeley
- Mary Wood, UC Davis
- Mitchell Brown, UC Irvine
- Angela Riggio, UCLA
- Susan Mikkelsen, UC Merced
- Rhonda Neugebauer, UC Riverside
- Nancy Stimson, UC San Diego
- Anneliese Taylor, UC San Francisco
- Sherri Barnes, UC Santa Barbara
- Ken Lyons and Frank Gravier, UC Santa Cruz

### III. Definitions

The assessment team used the following definitions of key words and phrases in the survey and throughout this report.

- Applications / Applied: formal requests from campus authors for OA funds received at campus libraries during the pilot
- Awards / Awarded: OA funding requests that met guidelines set by each campus library and were approved for funding during the pilot
- Full Open Access Journals: journals offering free, immediate, online availability of all research articles, coupled with the rights to use these articles fully in the digital environment
- Hybrid Open Access Journals: journals available by subscription, with the option offered to authors to pay a fee (APC) to make particular articles in the journal open access
- Article Publishing Charge (APC): a fee that some open access journals charge to authors in order to publish an article, often paid by an author's institution or research funder rather than by the author personally; also known as a publication fee

Also, note that “open access” is abbreviated as “OA” and “article publishing charge” is abbreviated as “APC” throughout.

### IV. About the Survey

Questions for the OA Publishing Fund Pilot Survey were originally proposed by Ivy Anderson and Jacqueline Wilson, CDL, and revised and expanded by CLS members. The assessment team modified and reorganized the questions to fit the survey format. The questions gathered quantitative and qualitative information on the implementation of the pilot on each campus throughout the official pilot period from October 2012 through March 2014.

Using the UC Davis Survey Monkey account, UC Davis Library IT created and managed the 32-question survey; see the [appendix](#) for the full text of the questions. The survey was sent electronically on April 21, 2014, to each local campus fund administrator (see list in section II. above), with a proposed end date of May 2, 2014; the response was 100%, with the final submissions received June 11, 2014.

### V. Demographics (Survey Questions 4, 5A-B, 6A-B)

A total of 506 applications were received during the pilot period. The highest number, 217, was at UC Berkeley (see section VI. below), and the lowest number, seven, was at UC Riverside. The rest of the campuses ranged between 21 and 60 applications.

Applications were submitted by individuals from 178 unique departments. The highest number of departments (37) was again at UC Berkeley (see section VI. below) and the lowest (five) at UC Riverside, with the other campuses ranging from ten to 23 departments from which individuals submitted applications. Although it's difficult in some cases to compare directly

because department names and subject areas are not uniform across all the campuses, applications came from faculty and researchers at similar departments on multiple campuses, as shown in Table 1.

**Table 1: Number of applications from individuals in similar departments at multiple campuses**

Department	Applications	Campuses
Psychology	28	8
Chemistry	20	7
Ecology, Behavior, and Evolution	25	6
Molecular and Cell Biology	15	5
Environmental Science Policy and Management	54	4
Electrical Engineering and Computer Science	14	4
Bioengineering	8	4
Anthropology	5	4
Cardiology	4	4

When the applicants' departments are divided into broader subject categories (those used for other CDL analyses), representation at multiple campuses grows even higher; see Table 2 below. The fact that UC San Francisco is the only campus from which no applicants came from the social sciences or the physical sciences and engineering can be explained by the fact that it is a graduate/professional school in the health sciences, and UCLA's representation in two categories on its own may be attributed to the fact that its initiative focused on teaching materials rather than research articles (see section VII. below). OA journal options in the arts and humanities and languages and area studies are more limited than they are in some of the other broad subject categories which may account for the smaller number of applications in these areas.

**Table 2: Number of applications from individuals divided into broad subject categories across all campuses**

Category	Applications	Campuses
Health and life sciences	253	10
Physical sciences and engineering	142	9 (all but UCSF)
Social sciences	56	9 (all but UCSF)
Arts and humanities	8	1 (UCLA)
Ethnic studies	3	2
Languages and area studies	3	1 (UCLA)
Other/unknown	4	3

Across all ten campuses, a total of 493 individuals submitted applications, of which 295 came from faculty members, 94 from graduate students, 48 from post-docs, 39 classified as "other" (see below), and 17 from staff. The "other" category included emeriti, adjuncts, a scientist not

affiliated with the university, lecturers, an instructor, and professional students. No campus received applications from undergraduate students.

**Table 3: Number of Unique Applicants by Status**

Campus	Faculty	Staff	PostDocs	Graduate Students	Other
UCB	126	4	22	41	24
UCSD	30	4	4	15	1
UCI	30	1	2	6	
UCSF	23	7	3	1	5
UCD	23	1	7	8	
UCSC	14		3	14	
UCLA	15				9
UCSB	12		5	6	
UCM	17		1	3	
UCR	5		1		
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>295</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>39</b>

The largest number of applicants again came from UC Berkeley (217) (see section VI. below) and the lowest from UC Riverside (six). Three campuses received applications from 39 individuals, with the other campuses ranging from 21 to 54 applicants.

## VI. Explanation of Berkeley's Numbers

Established in January 2008, the Berkeley Research Impact Initiative (BRII) was one of the first campus OA funds to be established in the U.S. It has evolved over the years and provides funding for both authors of journal articles and publishers of OA monographs and journals. In the case of authors, during the pilot period the initiative funded the APCs for any full open access journal up to \$3,000 or for any hybrid journal up to \$1,500. The initiative also provides funding to UC Berkeley-based publishers who publish OA monographs or OA journals on the eScholarship platform.

The longstanding nature of the Berkeley program explains its survey numbers, which are much higher than the other campuses.

## VII. Explanation of UCLA's Numbers

The UCLA Library had been working with students and the ASUCLA Store for several years to more effectively leverage Library collections in order to bring down costs of course readers

when this funding opportunity from CDL became available. Around the same time, Library staffers had begun looking into programs created at UMass Amherst and Temple, where the libraries worked with instructors to find or create alternatives to high-priced textbooks. The CDL funding presented the chance to build on the work with the ASUCLA Store and pilot an initiative similar to those at UMass Amherst and Temple. There was also an economic argument: with \$20,000 the Library might be able to make 20 articles open access, but the same amount of money could help hundreds of students save thousands of dollars.

Created with funds from CDL, the UCLA executive vice provost, and the UCLA Library, the UCLA Library's Affordable Course Materials Initiative pilot encouraged instructors to use low-cost or free alternatives to expensive course materials, such as open-access scholarly resources; Library-licensed or owned resources in print or digital format; and learning objects and texts that faculty create themselves. Financial as well as collection development awards were designated; the latter were used to build Library holdings of materials assigned for specific courses, and librarians and staff provided personalized assistance to all award recipients by identifying and digitizing materials needed for instruction.

A shorthand impression of the initiative's impact is that to date, it has helped more than 1,000 students save a collective total of \$112,000. The initiative's effectiveness is also being measured through qualitative information including success in meeting educational objectives, challenges/benefits of participating, and student feedback on course materials.

## VIII. Survey Results and Findings

### A. *Journals and Publishers (Survey Questions 7A-B, 8A-B, 10)*

The journals and publishers represented in the **applications** were similarly represented in the **awards**. There were a total of 302 unique journal titles in the applications, representing 159 unique publishers. Of the more than 500 applications submitted, 100 were for articles in *PLOS One*, which ranked first at every campus (except UCLA; see section VII. above). Of the more than 500 applications submitted, 173 were for articles published by either PLOS or BMC. Among those applications that were awarded, PLOS clearly led the publisher list, with BMC a distant second.

The most common journals and publishers in both the applications and awards are arranged by campus in Table 4, below. This table lists the top three journals and publishers applied for and awarded at each campus. If less than three are listed, it is because the remaining journals/publishers applied for or awarded on that campus were represented only once. When more than three are listed, it is because the journals/publishers applied for or awarded were represented equally and therefore could not be differentiated. The numbers in superscript reflect the actual number that each campus received/awarded for that journal title or publisher.

**Table 4: Applications and Awards by Journal Titles and Publishers (top three/most significant listed, actual numbers in superscript)**

	UCR	UCB	UCSD	UCSF	UCSB	UCSC	UCI	UCM	UCD
<b>APPLICATIONS : journals</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Forum of Math., Sigma<sup>1</sup></li> <li>• Frontiers in Human Neuroscience<sup>1</sup></li> <li>• Frontiers in Perception Science<sup>1</sup></li> <li>• PLOS One<sup>1</sup></li> <li>• Psychonomic Bulletin and Review<sup>1</sup></li> <li>• Research in Autism Spectrum Disorder<sup>1</sup></li> <li>• Scientific Reports<sup>1</sup></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PLOS One<sup>37</sup></li> <li>• Environmental Research Letters<sup>7</sup></li> <li>• New Journal of Physics<sup>5</sup></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PLOS One<sup>15</sup></li> <li>• Translational Psychiatry<sup>4</sup></li> <li>• Nucleic Acids Research<sup>4</sup></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PLOS One<sup>11</sup></li> <li>• Medical Education Online<sup>2</sup></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PLOS One<sup>8</sup></li> <li>• PLOS Computational Biology<sup>4</sup></li> <li>• Climate of the Past<sup>2</sup></li> <li>• Optics Express<sup>2</sup></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PLOS One<sup>9</sup></li> <li>• Ecology and Evolution<sup>3</sup></li> <li>• G3: Genes, Genomes, Genetics<sup>2</sup></li> <li>• Journal of Pragmatics<sup>2</sup></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PLOS One<sup>4</sup></li> <li>• Frontiers in Computational Neuroscience<sup>2</sup></li> <li>• Journal of Neuro-Engineering and Rehabilitation<sup>2</sup></li> <li>• New Journal of Physics<sup>2</sup></li> <li>• PNAS<sup>2</sup></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PLOS One<sup>6</sup></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PLOS One<sup>10</sup></li> <li>• PLOS Neglected Tropical Diseases<sup>4</sup></li> <li>• Journal of Neurodevelopmental Disorders<sup>3</sup></li> </ul>
<b>APPLICATIONS : publishers</b>	Cambridge <sup>1</sup> Elsevier <sup>1</sup> Frontiers <sup>2</sup> Nature <sup>1</sup> PLOS <sup>1</sup> Springer <sup>1</sup>	PLOS <sup>44</sup> BMC <sup>25</sup> Springer <sup>14</sup>	PLOS <sup>18</sup> BMC <sup>8</sup> Nature <sup>6</sup>	PLOS <sup>11</sup> BMC <sup>9</sup> Dove Medical Press <sup>3</sup>	PLOS <sup>12</sup> Copernicus <sup>3</sup> Springer <sup>3</sup>	PLOS <sup>9</sup> Springer <sup>4</sup> Wiley <sup>4</sup>	BMC <sup>5</sup> PLOS <sup>4</sup> Wiley <sup>4</sup>	PLOS <sup>8</sup> Frontiers <sup>2</sup>	PLOS <sup>15</sup> BMC <sup>5</sup> Frontiers <sup>3</sup>
<b>AWARDS : journals</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Forum of Math., Sigma<sup>1</sup></li> <li>• Frontiers in Human Neuroscience<sup>1</sup></li> <li>• PLOS One<sup>1</sup></li> <li>• Scientific Reports<sup>1</sup></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PLOS One<sup>24</sup></li> <li>• Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics<sup>4</sup></li> <li>• New Journal of Physics<sup>3</sup></li> <li>• Nucleic Acids Research<sup>3</sup></li> <li>• PLOS Neglected Tropical Diseases<sup>3</sup></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PLOS One<sup>11</sup></li> <li>• Translational Psychiatry<sup>3</sup></li> <li>• Atmospheric Chemistry &amp; Physics<sup>2</sup></li> <li>• BMC Evolutionary Biology<sup>2</sup></li> <li>• Nucleic Acids Research<sup>2</sup></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PLOS One<sup>9</sup></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PLOS One<sup>8</sup></li> <li>• PLOS Computational Biology<sup>4</sup></li> <li>• Optics Express<sup>2</sup></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PLOS One<sup>6</sup></li> <li>• Ecology and Evolution<sup>3</sup></li> <li>• G3: Genes, Genomes, Genetics<sup>2</sup></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PLOS One<sup>4</sup></li> <li>• Journal of Neuroengineering and Rehabilitation<sup>2</sup></li> <li>• PNAS<sup>2</sup></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PLOS One<sup>5</sup></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PLOS One<sup>10</sup></li> <li>• PLOS Neglected Tropical Diseases<sup>4</sup></li> <li>• Journal of Neurodevelopmental Disorders<sup>3</sup></li> </ul>
<b>AWARDS : publishers</b>	Cambridge <sup>1</sup> Frontiers <sup>1</sup> Nature <sup>1</sup> PLOS <sup>1</sup>	PLOS <sup>28</sup> BMC <sup>13</sup> Frontiers <sup>8</sup>	PLOS <sup>12</sup> BMC <sup>5</sup> Frontiers <sup>4</sup> Nature <sup>4</sup>	PLOS <sup>9</sup> BMC <sup>3</sup> Dove Medical Press <sup>2</sup>	PLOS <sup>12</sup> Copernicus <sup>3</sup> BMC <sup>2</sup>	PLOS <sup>6</sup> Wiley <sup>3</sup> Genetic Society of America <sup>2</sup>	BMC <sup>5</sup> PLOS <sup>4</sup> Institute of Physics/IOP <sup>3</sup> Wiley <sup>3</sup>	PLOS <sup>6</sup>	PLOS <sup>15</sup> BMC <sup>5</sup> Frontiers <sup>3</sup> Nature <sup>3</sup> Wiley <sup>3</sup>

**B. Hybrids versus Fully OA (Survey Questions 9A-B; 12A, B, C; 22)**

Of the 507 total applications, 432 were approved; of those, 141 were for articles in hybrid journals, and 331 were for articles in full OA journals. Five campuses (Davis, Merced, Riverside, San Diego, and Santa Barbara) did not fund hybrids; of the 45 applications not approved, 24 were denied due to being for hybrid journals. Other frequent reasons given for applications being turned down were lack of funding and the journal or the author not meeting campus eligibility requirements.

**Table 5: Applications and Awards in Hybrids and Fully OA Journals**

Campus	# ARTICLES		# APPLICATIONS FOR	
	Requested	Approved	Hybrids	Full OA
UCB	217	217	81	136
UCSD	60	41	7	52
UCD	39	36	2	37
UCI	39	30	24	15
UCSF	39	26	6	33
UCSC	31	23	11	20
UCLA	27	23	0	0
UCSB	27	19	6	21
UCM	21	12	0	15
UCR	7	5	4	2
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>507</b>	<b>432</b>	<b>141</b>	<b>331</b>

**C. Financial Data (Survey Questions 13, 14, 15A-B, 16A-B, 17, 18, 19, 24, 25, 27, 28)**

The UC Libraries and CDL collectively made a total of \$379,920 available to fund UC author OA publication fees and the UCLA Affordable Course Materials Initiative during the official OA Publishing Fund pilot period. CDL provided \$10,000 per campus for a total contribution of \$100,000. The amount each campus designated for its pilot ranged from \$10,000 to \$60,000. At the end of the pilot, unspent funds at each campus ranged from zero to \$44,361.

**Table 6: Pilot Fund Allocations and Fund Balance at End of Pilot**

<b>Campus</b>	<b>Pilot Fund Allocations in Dollars</b>	<b>Fund Balance at End of Pilot in Dollars</b>
UCSB	60,000	44,361
UCB	54,000	0
UCSD	47,500	931
UCD	43,420	10,020
UCSF	40,000	7,075
UCSC	40,000	12,354
UCI	40,000	8,257
UCLA	30,000	2,500
UCM	15,000	31
UCR	10,000	3,375
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>379,920</b>	<b>88,904</b>

All campuses except UC Riverside supplemented the CDL allocation with local campus funds; these initial supplements ranged from \$5,000 to \$44,000. Local campus funds came from a variety of sources including regular collection funds, collection endowment funds, general library budgets, and university librarian special funds. Some campuses made additional allocations to their funds during the course of the pilot program; those supplements ranged from \$10,000 to \$37,500. The executive vice chancellor was the source of additional funding at UCSB and a partial source at UCLA.

APCs awarded during the pilot ranged from \$986 to \$1,655, with a mean overall APC of \$1,343. The lowest APCs ranged from \$165 to \$1,000, while the highest APCs ranged from \$1,000 to \$3,600.

Five campuses reported that all their originally allocated pilot funds were fully expended, while the other five campuses reported they were not fully spent by the end of the pilot. Six campuses – UC Berkeley, UCLA, UC Merced, UC San Francisco, UC Santa Barbara, and UC Santa Cruz – reported that they were working on strategies to continue their pilots with funds from potential local sources including collections budgets and campus partners such as the Academic Senate. Three campuses – UC Davis, UC Irvine, and UC San Diego – reported that they did not plan to replenish their funds. However, note that all those decisions may have changed since the pilot concluded and the survey was completed.

A total of \$408,696 was applied for during the pilot; the totals applied for on individual campuses ranged from \$3,375 to \$62,664. A total of \$309,146 was awarded across the campuses, while totals awarded by individual campuses ranged from \$3,375 to \$54,000. Some transactions were not fully completed by the end of the pilot.

**Table 7: Applications and Amounts Awarded in Dollars**

<b>Campus</b>	<b>Amount in Dollars Applied For</b>	<b>Amount in Dollars Awarded</b>
UCSD	70,679	46,569
UCI	62,664	39,997
UCB	54,000	54,000
UCSF	53,869	32,926
UCSC	48,829	27,646
UCSB	45,857	28,865
UCD	37,300	33,300
UCM	32,123	14,968
UCR	3,375	3,375
UCLA		27,500
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>408,696</b>	<b>309,146</b>

The methods that campuses used to reimburse UC authors included interdepartmental transfers, direct deposit, and paying publishers directly for open access fees. Eight campuses used interdepartmental fund transfers, while five of those campuses also used direct deposits\*. UC San Diego gave payment authorizations to individuals who paid with credit card, check, or other personal means. UC San Francisco paid publishers directly on an invoice or partial invoice, and UC Santa Cruz paid publishers directly upon receipt of an invoice.

Four campuses reported no administrative problems reimbursing authors. Other campuses encountered a variety of challenges in author reimbursements, including coordinating with the author's payee department, time-consuming communications with departmental staff, and getting departmental staff to submit detailed invoices in a timely manner. Graduate students and assistant professors had more difficulty paying for article fees from their own funds than did associate and full professors.

#### ***D. Eligibility (Survey Questions 20, 21)***

All campuses defined who was eligible to apply, some more broadly than others. UC Riverside accepted applications from faculty, post-docs, researchers, and graduate students only; UC Irvine expanded that to staff; UC Merced also included students (status unspecified); UC San Francisco stated that non-salaried faculty members were ineligible; and UCLA required that applicants be formal instructors of record and that courses be for enrolled students only (i.e., not extension courses).

---

\* Direct deposit uses the same accounting procedure used for employee paychecks. It is reported to be simpler and easier than issuing personal checks.

Some campuses placed limits on the number of applications or awards. UC Berkeley and UC San Francisco limited applicants to one application per year, and UC San Francisco also limited labs to two applications per year. UC Davis, UC Irvine, and UC Merced limited applicants to one award per year.

### ***E. Campus Fund Administration Guidelines and Practices (Survey Questions 22, 23)***

When looking systemwide, there was relatively little uniformity across all the campuses in guidelines and practices they followed in administering their funds, though there were commonalities among smaller groupings of campuses. Some campuses changed their guidelines and practices during the pilot, in many cases due to changes in their level of available funding.

Aside from the date limits imposed by the pilot period itself, five campuses placed date limits on funds. At UC Berkeley applicants had to request reimbursement within six months of payment of an invoice. UC Davis initially set date limits, but funds ran out before those limits were reached. UC Merced stopped accepting applications on the pilot end date, but funds remain available until pending articles are accepted for publication. UC San Diego initially required that applicants' articles be between acceptance and publication, then revised that to articles "in process" or "just published."

Reimbursement limits ranged from \$1,000 to \$3,000. UC Davis and UC Riverside had \$1,000 limits; UC San Diego started with a \$1,000 limit, went up to the full amount of APCs for a time, then went back to \$1,000; UC Berkeley, UC Irvine, and UC Santa Cruz set a limit of \$3,000 for full open access journals and \$1,500 for hybrid journals; and UC San Francisco limited payments to \$1,000 for hybrid journals and \$2,000 for full open access journals.

UC Berkeley, UC Irvine, UC San Diego, and UC San Francisco stated that those authors with grants that funded APCs would not be eligible for an award, although UC San Diego was willing to consider exceptions.

UC Davis, UC Merced, UC Riverside, UC Santa Barbara, and UC San Diego limited funding to full open access journals only. UC San Francisco specified that the journals must be peer-reviewed and apply policies and practices consistent with the OASPA's code of conduct and that full open access journals be indexed in the DOAJ. UC Santa Barbara funded articles in journals listed in the DOAJ and in hybrid journals that offer discounts to UC authors. UC Irvine specified that articles could not have embargo periods and fees could not cover color charges, page charges, illustration charges, or submission charges.

UC San Francisco was willing to accept applications for books and ETDs as well as articles but didn't receive any. UC Irvine's policy also covered fees for publishing open access ebooks with reputable publishers as well as fees charged by a data repository for archiving open access data. UC Riverside required applicants to provide the accepted manuscript and the publisher's invoice.

Each campus created a webpage to provide a central source of information for potential applicants. Links to each campus's detailed OA fund information can be found in the [appendix](#).  
*Note: Those links go to each campus's information about its current program, which may have*

*been revised since the conclusion of the pilot/completion of the survey and thus be different from the information in this report.*

#### ***F. Relationship to Open Access Policy of the Academic Senate of the University of California***

The assessment team found no significant differences in local fund use between campuses that have already implemented the UC Faculty Open Access Policy (UC Irvine, UC Los Angeles, and UC San Francisco) and those that have not. It should be noted that the UC Libraries Open Access Publishing Fund Pilot began well prior to the official start date of the faculty OA policy (November 2013) and ended not long after that date and that the policy does not require faculty to publish in OA journals; both may explain why there was no noticeable impact.

### **IX. Campus Impact, Challenges, Opportunities**

All campuses felt that the pilot's goal of encouraging and supporting faculty who wanted to make their research freely and immediately available to the public was achieved. Challenges that campuses identified include getting awardees to follow through with reimbursements, administrative problems with reimbursements, having to say no to some applicants, and increased demands on library staff members' time.

Local goals ranged from the broad – changing publishing behavior – to the specific – reaching out to certain departments or schools. UC Davis noted that the pilot gave librarians the opportunity to also talk about the UC Faculty Open Access Policy. At UC San Francisco the pilot helped librarians and staff highlight the importance of authors retaining copyright control and in fact had to turn down one application where the publisher required that the author transfer copyright.

A common benefit expressed by a number of campuses was that the pilot gave them the opportunity to work closely with faculty and others on an issue of deep faculty concern and enabled them to initiate conversations about open access and build closer relationships with individuals and departments. Though this was not part of the reasoning behind the pilot's creation, it is a valuable lesson that may inform future campus-specific and systemwide approaches to outreach.

## **X. Recommendations**

This OA fund pilot was quite successful in that it identified a significant level of interest in an OA publishing fund on nine campuses. The other campus, UCLA, used their funding for an OA pilot focused on course materials (See Section VII).

The pilot was also unsuccessful in that eight campuses were unable to fully meet their funding needs. The only campus that was able to fund all of the applications it received, UC Berkeley, also noted in its reply to Question 19 that its longstanding program “is proving to be unsustainable”; after the pilot concluded, the campus made the decision to begin funding APCs for full OA journals only.

Given those facts, the main recommendation the assessment team offers is that UC needs to determine whether a UC open access publishing fund could be made truly sustainable. Until that question is answered, all other recommendations are secondary. The sustainability question has two parts: an accurate estimate of the scope of the need, and an identification of the sources for the amount of money needed to meet that need.

Developing an accurate estimate of the scope of the need will likely require information from multiple sources. These sources might include data gathered through UCLA’s implementation of its Opus system and through a systematic analysis of the results of the UC Academic Senate Open Access Policy once it is rolled out to all the campuses and the harvesting tool is fully operational. The sources may also include the results of a study CDL is currently developing to investigate institutional costs of Gold OA.

Finding a solution to meet the OA funding need may require a collaborative effort by the UC system as a whole. Faculty in every department across all ten campuses engage in scholarly publishing, so the effort to find adequate funds would need to be similarly broad based. In addition to the UC libraries, partners could include the UC president, chancellors, executive vice provosts, vice provosts for research, deans, and grant fund managers, among others.

Secondary recommendations include streamlining the application process; expanding it to other publication types such as monographs or shifting away from the focus on journal articles entirely; and focusing on specific populations such as new faculty, postdocs, or graduate students. The staff time and software knowledge needed to manage these efforts also need to be addressed before moving forward.

Finally, it would be helpful to continue to share information by setting up an annually updated web page/wiki containing current information on local policies, procedures and issues. It is likely that the OA publishing fund practices and policies of each UC campus and its library will continue to evolve as the individual campuses and the university as a whole move toward greater utilization and acceptance of OA journals and other OA publication formats.

## **XI. Appendix**

- A. *CLS-SAG1 Charge***
- B. *Campus Survey Form (Blank), April 2014***
- C. *Campus Survey Results Summary, July 2014 (PDF and XLSX)***
- D. *Links to UC Campus Open Access Fund Policies and Information Pages***