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Survey Results: Executive Summary

Introduction
Libraries and institutions that fund article processing charges (APCs) subsidize authors who publish scholarly articles in open access (OA) journals that require per-article payment. Funding APCs removes barriers to open publishing practices and promotes the value of OA to scholarship, research, and creative output. APC funds align the investment with the core mission and values of libraries. Libraries that offer such programs aspire to provide leadership in promoting the value of OA and proliferating OA practices among academic authors.

When conceptualizing these and other programs, libraries often look to their peer and aspirational institutions, including signatories of the Compact for Open-Access Publishing Equity (COPE) Initiative http://www.oacompact.org/, members of the Scholarly Publishing and Academic Resources Coalition (SPARC) http://sparcopen.org/open-access/, and members of the Association of Research Libraries (ARL). The purpose of this survey was to explore the strategies that ARL member institutions are using to address APCs—including how the funds are established and how they are handled (e.g., policies, applications, budgets, administration, outreach activities, etc.), sources of funding, and whether and under what circumstances libraries are partnering with other units (or other libraries) to fund this aspect of open access—and gather related policies and procedures. We asked libraries if their institution had a fund that subsidized APCs, but our focus was on the library’s role in the process. We did not attempt to find out about APC funding outside the library, such as grant funding or departmental support.

Overview
The survey was distributed to the 124 ARL member libraries in July 2016. Seventy-seven (62%) responded by the August 1 deadline. Twenty-three of the responding libraries (30%) currently have a fund and six are planning to start one in the near future (8%). Fourteen used to have a fund and 34 have no plans for a fund. The 2012 SPEC survey on scholarly communication services asked a similar question about whether the library administered an open access publishing fund. Forty-five libraries responded to both surveys. A comparison of their responses in 2012 and 2016 shows movement in both directions. In 2012, 14 of those 45 respondents answered yes. In 2016, seven of them have an APC fund and seven no longer have a fund. Of the 31 respondents whose institutions did not offer a fund in 2012, seven now have an APC fund and two are planning a fund, three used to have a fund, and 19 still have no plans for one.

The addition of nine new respondents who have an APC fund shows a slight increase in the number of libraries that support OA publishing. And while SPARC’s surveys of North American institutions also show an increase in the number of funds from nine in 2009 to 51 in 2014, it is
noteworthy that the majority of respondents to this survey have either discontinued an APC fund (18%) or have no plans to implement one (44%). The number of APC-supporting institutional funds can also be counted on the Open Access Directory or the websites of OA journals that list funds as a service to authors. For example, Springer Nature lists 69 institutional funds in North America (55 in the U.S. and 14 in Canada; http://www.nature.com/openresearch/funding/).

Of the 36 libraries that currently have or formerly had an APC fund, a majority (58%) began with a pilot project. Pilots ran from four months to four years with two years being the most common timeframe. The earliest APC fund began in 2005 and the most recently established fund is less than one year old. Twenty-nine of these funds (81%) were started within the last six years.

An overwhelming majority of respondents (31 or 86%) collect or archive the articles they fund for the institutional repository (typically a requirement of receiving funding). From respondents’ comments, it appears that library staff usually follow up to make sure articles are deposited.

**Financing APCs**

Despite the fact that APC funds have existed for over ten years, libraries struggle to determine appropriate funding models or are still evaluating whether to even establish such a fund. Of the 36 libraries with an existing or discontinued fund, all but one contributed money from the library budget. Over half of these libraries also received some external funding, typically from the provost or research office. Two libraries used gift money to start their funds, and two received seed money from their consortia. In 2014, a global survey of libraries found that 70% were drawing funds from their materials budget, while 24% had some external funding to support APCs.4

We asked respondents for their FY16 fund allocation (in USD). For discontinued funds, they reported the allocation for the last fiscal year the fund was in operation. Allocations vary widely—from $15,000 to over $260,000. The median fund is $40,000. Half the libraries responded that funding levels for FY16 are about the same as the previous year. Most libraries with an existing fund have allocated about the same amount for FY17. However, one library increased its allocation by 57%, and one decreased its by 50% due to lack of support from campus partners. None of the reporting libraries are adding staff to handle any increases in APC funding requests. Four libraries submitted position descriptions and half of those specifically mention that a scholarly communication librarian is responsible for managing the OA fund, among other duties.

Respondents reported receiving requests to fund APCs as low as $74 and as high as $5200. The libraries did not necessarily cover the entire amount for higher fees, however. The two libraries that reported the highest APCs have a per-article funding cap well below that amount. No library paid more than $3000 per APC; authors had to make up the balance from other funds. The annual limit on reimbursement to individual authors ranges from $1000 to $5000, though all but two of the 27 responding libraries set the cap at $3000 or less (nine have a cap of $2000 or less).

Twenty-seven respondents (90%) reported that requests to fund APCs are sometimes denied, most often due to policies or practices that exclude hybrid OA journals or because authors have other sources of funding. Other reasons for denying requests included the article being accepted by what the funding authority deemed to be a “substandard” journal, lack of funds, or because co-authors were at other institutions.

Providing adequate funding for APCs is the biggest challenge for most libraries. Lack of financial resources drove numerous policy changes, including discontinuing the APC fund. A plethora of requests caused 49% of the surveyed institutions to reduce funding for authors, either by reducing the amount paid per article, placing a cap on individual reimbursement, or both. In other cases, funds no longer accepted applications for hybrid journal APCs.
Articles in the sciences have received most of the funding. Half of the commenting libraries specified funding articles in the medical and health sciences fields and 20% specified the life sciences. Funding for social science and arts and humanities articles were mentioned by 30%.

Hybrid OA Journals

Requests for APCs for hybrid journals are not funded at 27 of the reporting libraries (84%) for a variety of reasons. Most frequently (53%) institutions consider paying APCs for articles published in hybrid journals to be “double dipping.” This refers to the institution paying APCs in addition to the full subscription price of the journals. Institutions that fund OA articles in hybrid journals expect sufficient evidence that publishers are actually reducing subscription costs as a result of receiving APCs. Comments revealed that institutions would like the publishers to be more transparent about lowering subscription fees in proportion to the APC received. The percentage of libraries not funding articles in hybrid journals is significantly higher than the approximately 50% rates found in previous studies.

Other reasons for not funding hybrid journals include limited funding and “to incentivize publishing in, and support for, full OA journals.” However, one institution reported that “as part of a special promotion to attract more authors from the humanities, we will pay hybrid journal APCs for authors affiliated with the College of Arts & Humanities.” Institutions that fund APCs in hybrid OA journals do so because they want “to provide as much support as possible to authors publishing in OA journals,” though some do so with a reduced per-article cap.

The most significant advantage of funding hybrid APCs is that it greatly expands the author’s choice of publishing venue, roughly doubling the number of journals in which to publish OA. There have also been hopes that the hybrid model would help journals transition to full OA. Although some journals have made this transition, we are not aware of evidence showing that this is occurring at a significant scale. Respondents were primarily concerned with the issue of subscription offsetting, or “double dipping,” though hybrid OA suffers from other disadvantages such as higher APCs. Libraries with a subscription to a hybrid journal expect a direct offset (a credit against the subscription cost), and libraries without a subscription expect a global offset, benefiting all subscribers. However, these processes lack transparency, and a study of 24 major publishers found that their “no double-dipping” statements were not borne out in reality. Also, hybrid OA articles sometimes lack a metadata signal showing their access status, so discovery can still be a problem.

Policies and Procedures

Authors almost always apply to the library for APC funding; this stands to reason as the library usually administers the fund and controls the budget. Nearly all respondents (28 or 85%) indicated that they pay the invoices for APCs, however more than half of the libraries require or encourage the author(s) or their departments to pay the invoice before being reimbursed by the library. About one-third directly pay invoices through credit cards or checks. Only six institutions have deposit accounts and two mentioned wire transfers.

Requests for funds are evaluated on a variety of additional criteria. More than two-thirds of the respondents reported denying funding for articles submitted to journals that are not peer-reviewed or not listed in an OA registry like the Directory of Open Access Repositories. In addition, libraries expect funded publishers to adhere to an established code of conduct such as is required for membership in the Open Access Scholarly Publishers Association (OASPA).

Six of 20 respondents (30%) reported that they consider “Beall's List” (i.e., the formally named Scholarly Open Access blog subtitled “Potential, possible, or probable predatory scholarly open-access publishers” at https://scholarlyoa.com/publishers/) when evaluating publications for APC funding. Only
one considered the journal impact factor, and another had the author's department chair vet the journals. The request-for-funds forms typically ask whether the authors have other funds available.

While 20 out of 33 libraries responded that all members of their community are eligible to receive funding, comments from some of them reveal that they actually do allow all faculty, staff, and enrolled students to apply. Ten libraries explicitly exclude undergraduate student authors, although one library commented that they probably would consider proposals from undergraduate students. At one institution undergraduate authors must submit a letter of support from their faculty advisors. Some institutions have informal criteria, including “staff assessment of the merit and need of the particular researcher.” At another “postdocs and assistant professors were more likely to receive funding than full professors.”

Among those institutions that do not distribute or prorate APC awards among multiple authors, two extremes exist. At one extreme, every author from one institution on a multi-authored article is considered fully funded, which discourages collaborations. At the other extreme, every article is considered for funding as if it had only one author. The lack of cost sharing has been noted in the literature, since the primary author typically covers publication costs. Sharing costs with funders, or with other institutions on co-authored papers, would reduce the financial pressure on funds. However, in one study librarians thought such a process would be too inefficient.

We did not ask about an annual limit on the number of articles an author could get funded. However, comments for the funding caps question indicated that 78% of libraries limited authors to one article per year. Survey comments reveal that some funds discourage authors from applying for APC support more than once, and other libraries evaluate each APC request on its own merit. The literature shows that two funds use a point system to determine or prioritize fund recipients.

Fifteen libraries submitted their APC request forms. All of them ask for the name of the person requesting the funds and that person’s email address. The only other common element is the journal title, though 14 ask for the article title. Twelve ask about the status or classification of the author and about co-authors, department affiliations, and whether other funds are available. Twelve also ask about the status of the article, with seven asking if the article has been accepted and six asking about the expected date of publication. Eleven ask the amount of funds being requested and ten ask for the publisher, with only five asking for a link to the OA policies.

Procedures for managing OA funds are highly variable and dependent on internal administrative processes. Policies may fluctuate according to the levels of funding that are available.

**Libraries That Do Not Support APCs**

The majority of responding libraries (62%) have either discontinued their APC fund or have no plans to start one. The most common reason was lack of funding; many indicated they had exhausted available funds. Several libraries responded that continuing the APC fund was “unsustainable.” We interpreted this to mean that funds were insufficient to keep up with the demand. Only four libraries stated that lack of author interest led them to discontinue the APC fund.

At least two libraries commented that they did not view supporting APCs as helping to promote a broader transition to OA initiatives. These comments were echoed by the libraries that have no plans to initiate a fund. Skepticism about how APCs advance the goal of OA was pervasive. According to one respondent, “APCs are not particularly a cost-effective or scalable mechanism for furthering open access.” Another library that discontinued APC funding despite positive feedback from authors stated, “[s]ince the purpose of the Fund is to promote a broader transition to OA publishing...the $25,000 allocation could be spent more effectively on other initiatives, including memberships and pledges with innovative open access journal and monograph publishers, and library publishing cooperatives.”
Another factor contributing to the absence of an APC fund might be lack of direct financial support from the institution's administration. Half of the 14 libraries who discontinued their funds had received supplementary funding to support APCs. Most frequently, this funding came from the provost or office of research. By contrast, a smaller percentage of libraries who have maintained their APC fund indicated receiving external funds specifically earmarked for APCs.

**Promoting APC Funds**

Promoting awareness of funds is primarily achieved through library liaisons, the library website, word of mouth, and related OA activities. Half the libraries with current APC funds hold events for Open Access Week. To a lesser extent, libraries use email lists, newsletters or flyers, blogs, workshops, outreach through university governance, and journal sites (such as the PLOS list of OA funds). About one-third of libraries formally recognize recipients of APC funds, typically through listings on library websites or documents such as annual or periodic reports. For some libraries, a distinct collection in the institutional repository suffices to recognize authors who receive APC support. APC funds can create awareness of the institutional repository for authors, some of whom subsequently submit non-funded articles. Given many libraries' comments about APC funds becoming unsustainable and having to impose funding limits, it may be that outreach and promotion resulted in an “excess of interest,” which was noted as the cause of one fund's demise.

Fewer than half of the respondents share data from the fund openly. Of these, most provide this data on a website or in a blog, and about a quarter issue it in an annual report. Only one library shares the data in an online spreadsheet. Four comments indicated internal sharing or sharing “upon request.” This is somewhat ironic as several libraries bemoaned the fact that publishers are not more transparent about their funding models.

**Support for External Initiatives**

We also wanted to know how libraries support OA initiatives outside of paying APCs. This includes memberships that support making books or journal articles open to the world, such as SCOAP3, Open Library of humanities, and Knowledge Unlatched. Fifty-eight libraries do provide support in this way, compared with 23 libraries that subsidize APCs. Memberships were the most common form of support (48 of 58 respondents). Three libraries mentioned HathiTrust as an example of support, “since it is OA after the fact.” It is also notable that of the 48 libraries that either discontinued their APC fund or have no plans to start one, 32 support other OA initiatives such as the ones mentioned above.

**Discussion**

The significant growth in the number of APC-funded OA journals and hybrid journals has not been accompanied by a similar growth in the number of ARL libraries funding APCs. For example, between 2013 and 2016, Elsevier increased the number of its APC-funded OA journals from 46 to 550, while APC fund growth has been much more gradual. Among existing funds, few support hybrid OA, and libraries with no APC fund or a discontinued fund exhibit significant skepticism of APCs as a sustainable model for funding OA.

There are numerous advantages to library or institutional APC funds. APCs are direct support for an institution's authors, whereas an institution may not have evidence of its authors publishing in a journal it subsidizes. This support is often met with gratitude by authors, and funding APCs expands the role of libraries within their institutions. Many libraries advocate for OA practices, and APC funds remove a barrier to authors for OA publishing. Choice of where to publish is sometimes considered an aspect of academic freedom, and can be part of the rationale for an APC fund. Because APCs are listed on journal sites for all to see, there is a degree of cost transparency that does not exist in the
subscription market. Practices such as caps on per-article funding are a price control with no equivalent in journal subscriptions.

However, the problems of APC funds are just as numerous. Perhaps the largest problem is that there is no easy way to transfer funding from journal subscription budgets, so APC funds become an additional cost to libraries or their institutions. A survey of Canadian libraries found that fluctuations in requests can make budgeting for APC funds difficult. There are also signs that APCs have continued the market concentration in scholarly journals, with one survey finding that 10 publishers received 92% of the APCs. For those funds that exclude grant-funded authors, grant support can be difficult to verify, and there can be problems when articles are accepted after grant funding has ended. Beyond institutional needs, there are wider concerns that APC costs cannot be met by researchers from developing countries or without an institutional affiliation, even though some journals have waiver policies.

One limitation of this survey is that it includes only ARL member institutions. Institutional OA funds for APCs exist around the world, and also include many medium and small North American institutions. A significant limitation of all surveys of central APC funds at institutions is that these funds likely cover only a minority of APCs paid on those campuses. One institution without an APC fund acknowledged this by commenting “…we believe that funding for APCs is going on but in a distributed way outside of library operations.” Evidence from the literature indicates that institutions only account for about a quarter of the APCs paid. Research on APC spending is severely hampered because institutions lack comprehensive data on the APCs paid by their authors. Future research would be enabled if APC funds published open data on their expenditures, as institutions in Austria, Germany, and the United Kingdom already are. This action would improve decision-making and embody the data practices that many ARL libraries are communicating to their researchers. Future research on OA funds would also be aided by libraries with current or discontinued funds recording information on those respective wiki pages at the Open Access Directory.

This survey, as well as the existing literature, suggest numerous avenues for further research:

- How can libraries create budget flexibility to support both subscriptions and OA publishing, including APCs?
- What are author attitudes toward APC funds, and how do the funds affect the relevance of the library to the institution?
- What is the role of consortia in APC funding? Could APCs be included in negotiations with publishers? Could consortia support authors at institutions without a fund?
- Which departments on campus provide APC funding to their authors? What is the fund size and what are their policies?
- What are the outcomes when co-authors from other institutions are not supported? If the APC-based article is published, what source(s) covered the remaining cost?
- How can library or institutional APC funds be assessed? How is success measured? Could OA funds be measured as a percentage of collections budgets? Could the number of articles funded be measured as a percentage of an institution’s total article output?

**Conclusion**

Most ARL libraries support OA in a variety of ways and are bringing discussions about OA to the forefront not only through APC funds but also by funding external OA initiatives, hosting OA events, and holding conversations with faculty and researchers. Libraries are addressing the challenges of changing publishing models, but since the majority of respondents to this survey have either discontinued support for APCs, or have decided not to start, it is clear the community is not wholeheartedly convinced that paying for APCs is the best way to change the traditional business model.
While a minority of responding libraries (23, or 30%) currently have APC funds, and some of them are struggling with success and demand outweighing funding and/or administrative support, the number of funds appears to be stable or growing slowly. The growth rate does not match the expansion of the model among journals, or its popularity among authors, though. This is likely due to the difficulty of shifting funding from subscriptions to APCs.

Because the theories and practices are evolving rapidly, stakeholders are monitoring trends and opportunities. Where funds do exist, the release of detailed open APC data will enable further research. In addition, libraries will need to gather APC data comprehensively, since central APC funds likely account for a minority of APC spending at their institutions.

This SPEC Kit brings together information that will help institutions that are considering funding APCs, and it documents the current APC landscape in North American research libraries while focusing on one strategy that some ARL member institutions are using to address OA journal funding. With this survey data and analysis, ARL and its members can better understand their place in the evolving arena of OA, review strategies that foster public access to peer-reviewed scholarship, and consider how these activities are transforming the university policies and practices. The survey data document current policies and practices and how they serve the larger academic communities. The data and analysis contribute to understanding the range of considerations for OA funding models. This investigation can also inform the development and assessment of models of scholarly communication and publishing. Finally, it will contribute to a better understanding of how OA funds address the expectations and needs of university communities and how such funds support the library’s mission.

**Endnotes**

1. Open Access (OA) is such a common term among libraries that we did not provide the usual definition crafted succinctly by Peter Suber. “Open-access (OA) literature is digital, online, free of charge, and free of most copyright and licensing restrictions.” [http://legacy.earlham.edu/~peters/wfos/overview.htm](http://legacy.earlham.edu/~peters/wfos/overview.htm)


16 Jackie Proven, *LOCH Pathfinder project: St Andrews Library Open Access Fund: business case and criteria*, St. Andrews: University of St. Andrews Library, 2016, 1, [https://research-repository.st-andrews.ac.uk/handle/10023/8504](https://research-repository.st-andrews.ac.uk/handle/10023/8504).


Survey Questions and Responses

The SPEC Survey on Funding Article Processing Charges was designed by Gail McMillan, Director of Scholarly Communication, Leslie O’Brien, Director of Collections and Technical Services and Philip Young, Scholarly Communication Librarian, at Virginia Tech Libraries. These results are based on responses from 77 of the 124 ARL member libraries (62%) by the deadline of August 1, 2016. The survey’s introductory text and questions are reproduced below, followed by the response data and selected comments from the respondents.

The open access (OA) approach to scholarly communication requires new business models for publishing that counter traditional journal subscriptions. It promises to make scholarly literature more accessible and more affordable, impacting researchers and readers, libraries and publishers, academe, and the public alike. One approach is to require authors to pay article processing charges (APC) for publishing their peer-reviewed articles in OA journals. As a result, a growing number of universities are establishing funds to make the research published by their faculty and students publicly available.

This new and evolving business model affects many in the publication chain, with libraries playing a significant role in arranging for and processing APCs. The purpose of this survey is to explore the strategies that ARL member institutions are using to address APCs—including how the funds are established and how they are handled (e.g., policies, applications, budgets, administration, outreach activities, etc.), sources of funding, and whether and under what circumstances libraries are partnering with other units (or other libraries) to fund this aspect of open access—and gather related policies and procedures. The resulting data will inform the development and assessment of models of scholarly communication, and will reveal common or best administrative practices that facilitate processing APCs for the library community at large.

BACKGROUND

1. Does your institution currently have a fund that subsidizes article publication charges (APCs) for open access scholarly peer-reviewed articles? N=77

   Yes 23 30%
   We had a fund but we no longer have one 14 18%
   We’re planning to implement a fund in the future 6 8%
   No and we don’t plan to implement a fund in the foreseeable future 34 44%
APC FUND DISCONTINUED

2. Please enter the year the fund was discontinued. N=14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Please indicate why the fund was discontinued. Check all that apply. N=14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of funding</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of author interest</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of administrative support</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other reason</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please briefly describe the other reason. N=9

Authors most often funded have other options for funding APCs.

Funding APCs proved to be unsustainable.

It was a two-year pilot program.

Ours was a 6-month pilot project to gauge the interest in and feasibility of offering this kind of service. The pilot project was funded by the University Libraries and the Health Sciences Library, with the understanding that funding for an ongoing service would need to come from outside of the Libraries. Another funding source has not yet been identified.

The Libraries’ OA Fund pilot was successful and garnered a wealth of positive feedback from authors. Since the purpose of the fund is to promote a broader transition to OA publishing, however, we believe that the $25k allocation could be spent more effectively on other initiatives, including memberships and pledges with innovative open access journal and monograph publishers, and library publishing cooperatives. The data supplied in this survey represents the second full year of the fund in operation.

The fund assisted very few authors and was not utilized by many, but fully utilized/expended. It was not deemed to be an appropriate use of library resources by senior administration and not an appropriate role for the library. The library determined that the notion of author fees was not really advancing open access and was in fact creating access issues of a different kind—access to scholarly publishing, tenure and promotion, etc. It was also not really solving the issues around containment of resource costs, as there was now just another set of escalating costs. Multiple reasons for abandoning/discontinuing the fund.

The fund was unsustainable at scale, and in my view, a poor return on investment. It was mostly repeat players and people abusing co-authoring.

Unsustainable.

We didn't have a policy in place to market the fund initially. In succeeding years we did not have adequate collections funding to continue. Funding was available for 2014/2015 but nothing was expended due to all the reasons checked above.
Please complete as much of the survey as possible with information about this fund. For questions that ask about an APC fund in FY16, please use data from the last year your fund existed.

**APC FUND INITIATIVE**

4. Please enter the year the fund began. N=36

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. What is the name of the fund (e.g., open access subvention fund)? N=36

- Columbia Open-Access Publication Fund
- COPE Open Access Fund
- Cornell Open Access Publishing (COAP) fund
- Duke University Compact for Open Access Publishing Equity (COPE) Fund
- Emory Open Access Publishing Fund
- HOPE- Harvard Open Access Publishing Equity
- Northwestern Open Access Fund
- OhioLINK Open Access Subvention Fund
- Open Access Author Fund
- Open Access Author's Fund
- Open Access Authors Fund
- Open Access Fund (3 responses)
- Open Access Fund for OSU Authors Pilot
- Open Access Journal Support
- Open Access Promotion Fund
- Open Access Publication Fund
- Open Access Publishing Fund
- Open Access Publishing Support Fund (2 responses)
- Open Access Research and Scholarship (OARS) Fund
- Open Access Subvention Fund (2 responses)
Open Publishing Support Fund
SIU COPE (SIU Carbondale Open-Access Publishing Equity) Fund
SOAR (Supporting Open Access Research) Fund
The One University Open Access Author Fund
UCI Libraries Open Access Publishing Fund
UMD Libraries Open Access Publishing Fund
University Libraries and Office of the Provost Open Access Fund
University of Florida Open Access Publishing Fund
University of Toronto Open Access Author’s Fund
UVA Library Open Access Fund
Western Libraries Open Access Fund
York University Libraries Open Access Author Fund

6. **Did your institution implement a pilot project to begin the APC funding initiative? N=36**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*If yes, please briefly describe the scope and duration of the pilot project. N=20*

2-year pilot project. Scope was the same as the current fund: available to the entire VT community; $1500 max per article; $3000 max per author per year. Included hybrid journals.

24 months of promotion through various faculty venues.

In 2009, the university signed on to the Compact for Open-Access Publishing Equity and in January 2010, the provost and the library each contributed $25,000 to establish a fund, administered by the library, to support fee-based OA publishing by university authors (faculty, staff, students). The initial funding held out till 2014. This initial funding phase was treated as a pilot project. A final report recommended replenishing the fund and continuing the COAP program along the same lines as the pilot. Funding for the COAP program is reviewed on an annual basis, but to date the program has received three years of additional funding from the library and the provost.

In 2010, the library dean with support from the provost, pledged money to increase open access publishing on the campus. We looked for these qualities in a journal: the author retained their own copyright; the journal was fully open access; and access was immediate, not delayed. Qualifying authors got up to $3,000 depending on the policies of their journal. The fund ran from September 2010 through March 1, 2012.

It was based on tranches of funding. First tranche was $40k.

Our fund began as an open-ended pilot with $25,000. Uptake was such that we continued the fund and removed the pilot distinction.

Our pilot project began in December 2012 with seed money of $45,000. In the pilot, applicants had to be tenured/tenure-track faculty, and the funding limits were up to $2,000 for fully open access journals or $1,250 for commercial journals with an open access option. Funds could be reserved in advance and had to be used within six months. The pilot ran from December 2012–May 2013.
Technically we are still in it. We put $25,000 into the fund initially and publicized only by word-of-mouth.

The fund was initially funded with $120,000 from the provost and intended to last up to two years. The funds were expended in less than 18 months.

The fund was to help authors of open access articles with the publishing fees that are often associated with OA journals. University-affiliated authors were reimbursed up to $3,000 per fiscal year from this fund, for journal articles that are published in fully OA journals. This means that the article is immediately available to the public. Articles were also deposited in the institutional repository.

The initial pilot was two years. We’re in continuous beta so basically always in pilot mode. Currently we’re in the second two-year pilot.

The pilot project began in March until June 2013. It was fully implemented by FY 14.

The pilot was funded with $20,000, and planned to run until the funds were expended. It took about six months (10/14–5/15).

The scope of the pilot was to use the grant of up to $20,000 to: have a self-contained study of who would take advantage of such a service, and what would the range of author fees be that were faced by our local scholars; identification of partners for possible endorsement and additional funding ideas; development of policies and guidelines; creation of a consistent process for requesting funding; determination of fund administration practices.

The Libraries established a pilot program to cover a portion of the cost of author submission fees to such OA journals, with funding for the pilot project made available by the provost. Subject to availability of funding, the project will run from spring 2009 through spring 2010.

The University Libraries have been supporting open access initiatives through various channels since 2006. In 2009, a formal proposal was submitted to the university librarian outlining the suggested mechanisms by which OA support could proceed.

The university signed on to the Compact for Open-Access Publishing Equity in December 2009 to declare its support of open-access publishing business models. $50,000/year was initially made available in FY10 and was reduced in FY11 to $25,000/year to better match demand.

There was no real difference between pilot and implementation. The first year was a success and the fund has continued.

We allocated $20,000 from a gift fund to determine if there was a need and demand for OA funding. Initial funding lasted 18 months. After evaluating data, we established an ongoing fund from campus and gift dollars.

We were given $10K in funding from California Digital Library, which we matched with $30K in Libraries funding.

7. **Are funded articles collected or archived by your institution?** N=36

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>86%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
If yes, how are funded articles collected or archived? N=31

Authors are **required** to deposit their articles in the institutional repository 14 45%
Someone at the institution retrieves and deposits the article 7 23%
Authors may **voluntarily** deposit their articles in the institutional repository 6 19%
Other process 4 13%

**Please briefly describe the other process. N=4**

Articles are noted as supported by HOPE in our repository.
Authors are required to do it, but in practice, about half of the articles are collected by library staff.
Authors can submit or someone at the institution will submit for them.
Authors may voluntarily deposit their articles AND someone at the institution retrieves and deposits them.

**Additional comment N=1**

I’ve indicated that articles supported by our COAP fund are not archived by our institution. I think this response comes closest to the situation here: we are not currently tying our APC subsidy program to the deposit of articles in our IR, nor are we tracking whether authors who receive the subsidies are depositing their articles locally. However, we do manage an IR and funded authors are free to deposit their articles there.

**APC FUND FINANCING AND ADMINISTRATION**

8. Which unit(s) in your institution contribute money to the APC fund? Check all that apply. N=36

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration (provost, president, or chancellor)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of research</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual academic departments or colleges</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central budget office</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University press</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other unit</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Please specify the other unit. N=6**

It was both the main library and the medical library contributing money to the fund.
Office of research has contributed in the past.
OhioLINK contributed some funding to the project.
Provost Office
School of Medicine; School of Nursing
The pilot was funded by the University Libraries and the Health Sciences Library.
9. **Which unit(s) in your institution controls or administers the APC fund budget? Check all that apply.** N=36

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Library</th>
<th>35</th>
<th>97%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Office of research</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual academic departments or colleges</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central budget office</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration (provost, president, or chancellor)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University press</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other unit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Please specify the other unit.** N=1

OhioLINK

10. **If you answered “Library” above, which unit or position within the library administers the budget?** N=35

Acquisitions manages the APC fund budget.

Associate Dean, Scholarly Resources & Services

Associate University Librarian Collections and Research and EResources Librarian

Associate University Librarian for Collections and Scholarly Communications as part of the Scholarly Publishing Team.

AUL Collections but delegated to Research Services Librarian

Collection Development

Collection Development Librarian and Coordinator, OpenSIUC

Collection Management Librarian

Collections

Copyright Office

Decisions about allocating funds to the OARS project are made by the Libraries' management team in consultation with the university’s Faculty Council Committee on Libraries (FCCOL). FCCOL has been very involved in helping determine policies for distributing OARS funds and guidelines for funding eligibility. The application approval process is managed by a liaison librarian, who creates documentation about OARS policies and procedures, answers questions about the fund, and works with an administrative professional to get applications approved. The administrative professional screens applications to insure they are compliant with the guidelines, tracks how much money has been allocated, and compiles fund statistics. Payments are managed by the Libraries' Director of Fiscal Services.

Digital Collections and Strategies

Digital Scholarship Librarian, who is a part of the Digital Programs & Initiatives unit in the libraries.

Director of Collections and Liaison Services

Director, Scholarly Communications & Instructional Support (position no longer exists)

During the time the fund existed, the Health Sciences Library administered it.
I administer the program as Director of Collections, with assistance from our Scholarly Communications Librarian and a Digital Programs Associate. Now administered by committee with people from several areas across the library.

Office for Scholarly Communication
Publishing and Curation Services
Publishing and Repository Services
Research Support Standing Committee Library Information Resource Management Unit (technical services)
Scholarly Communication and Collections & Technical Services
Scholarly Communication Coordinator
Scholarly Communication Department. Recently transitioned the fund to a new position, the “Open Access and Institutional Repository Librarian.” Scholarly Communication Librarian reviews fund applications under the Associate Dean for Research and Scholarly Communication. Library administration allocates funds.

Scholarly Communications and Copyright Office
Scholarly Communications Librarian
Scholarly Communications Librarian administered the fund.

Scholarly Communications Office
Scholarly Resource Development Department
The Office of Copyright and Scholarly Communication, Outreach Coordinator for Open Access (interim; may remain permanently)

The Scholarly Communications Committee

The scholarly communications group
There’s a team that evaluates proposals and maintains a spreadsheet to make sure we don’t over-commit. The money itself is administered out of the Admin Office, which is where Fiscal Services is housed.

APC FUND ALLOCATION

11. How is the money allocated within the budgeting process? N=34

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A separate line item in the budget</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Included in other funding lines</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other process</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please briefly describe the other process. N=4

Currently, the money is allocated from funds considered contingency to the collections budget. Designated from available gift funds in the Libraries’ endowment portfolio. Discontinued Pulled out of collection budget, which is jointly managed. We will be bringing a request to supplement funding soon.
12. What is the fund allocation for FY16? Please specify in US dollars. Please enter a whole number without commas or a $ sign. N=25

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>263,750</td>
<td>49,600</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. How was this funding level determined? N=25

- 15,000 Historical requests and what the budget allows
- 15,000 Not known
- 20,000 It was what we managed to scrape together!
- 20,000 Somewhat arbitrarily. The director was able to put up $10K, and we could match that amount from the collections budget.
- 20,000 Soft funding based on pilot requested total
- 20,000 Somewhat arbitrarily. HSL declared that they would contribute a little under $10,000, and the main library system contributed enough to round the fund up to $20,000.
- 25,000 The available funding was kept consistent with the previous year’s in order to meet demand.
- 25,000 $50,000 allocated over two years: $25,000 from Libraries and $25,000 from other units (Admin/Research).
- 25,000 A combination of predicted need and availability of funds from budget
- 30,000 Based on prior fiscal year expenditures and projected number of requests expected.
- 30,000 Historical spending trend, demand
- 40,000 Based on previous years’ allocations and an annual consultation with the head of collection management.
- 40,000 Based on prior year’s applications and budget availability.
- 42,000 Past financial commitments were agreed upon by each of the funding units in previous fiscal years and were carried through to this year. The Head of Collections decides how much to allocate for the Libraries. The Vice Provost for Academic Affairs allocates the funds from the provost’s office. The deans of the Schools of Medicine and Nursing allocate funds for their schools.
- 45,000 This funding level was determined by the Libraries’ management team.
- 45,249 $60,000 CAD. Funding was retained at the same level as the previous year’s budget allocation.
- 48,000 The Libraries contributed $23,000 and additional funds were requested from the provost ($5,000) and the deans of the colleges/schools on campus (ranged from $2,000 to $3,000 from each dean).
- 50,000 The initial funding for the program pilot was $50,000 and part of the experiment was to see what the level of use would be and how long the funds would last. The initial funds were depleted in 3.5 years, with the rate of new applications accelerating over this time. Funds were renewed at the same level in 2014, but were depleted after only one year. The $50,000 has been an annual allocation since then and has been fully expended each year; in the 2015–16 academic year, funds were depleted mid-year and the program was put on hiatus until the new fiscal year. Program funding is reviewed each year with no guarantee of ongoing support.
- 50,000 The increase in requests from our users for open access funds.
- 60,000 Qualifying authors got up to $3,000 depending on the policies of their journal. If a journal was hybrid or delayed access, then the amount went down.
- 70,000 Based on past performance of and demand on fund
14. How does the FY16 allocation compare with previous years? N=30

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Smaller</th>
<th>Larger</th>
<th>About the same</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments N=10

**Smaller** N=4

Although budgeted at the same amount as previous years, we have historically allowed the fund to be over-spent. This will not be possible for this year.

Fund was discontinued.

The funding in the last year was almost exactly the same amount as it had been the year before.

The service was postponed due to budget issues halfway through FY16.

**Larger** N=2

The fund didn’t exist before FY16.

We anticipate that the growth of the fund will become unsustainable.

**About the same** N=4

Allocation has been $40,000 since 2013.

Fund was $25K for first and second year. Fund was pilot program for those two years. Additional $10K added after second year to continue fund until exhausted or more funds approved.

Initially $30,000 was approved, but due to demand, an additional $15,000 was released later in the year.

We are still in beta and trying to determine the right amount of funding. Usage is increasing.

15. If you answered “Larger” above, has an increase in funding led to an increase in staffing to handle the requests for funds? N=9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments N=2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Handling the requests is not too time intensive.

No additional staffing has been added. We are planning to hire a Scholarly Communications Librarian to manage the fund.
16. If you know your FY17 fund allocation, please specify it in US dollars. Please enter a whole number without commas or a $ sign. \(N=17\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>415,000</td>
<td>67,346</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Allocation</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49,880</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>415,000</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ARTICLES FUNDED BY APCS

17. What have been the highest and lowest APCs paid? Please enter an amount in US dollars for each, if known. Please enter a whole number without commas or a $ sign. \(N=32\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highest</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
<td>5,200.00</td>
<td>2,461.66</td>
<td>2,303.50</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowest</td>
<td>74.00</td>
<td>650.00</td>
<td>276.47</td>
<td>230.00</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highest</th>
<th>Lowest</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>We had a $1,000 cap on awards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>$1,000 per article (maximum $3,000 over period of the pilot)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,250</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>$500 (total charge for that article)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>We have a $1,500 cap per individual per year but definitely have authors who are paying above that amount in total APCs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>According to the rules of the fund, $1,500 was the maximum award amount from the fund. Many authors had funding requests that exceed $1,500 and the fund was able to pay the first $1,500 for those authors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>The fund's allocation limit is $1,500/article. The highest APC for an approved article was $3,000.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>First two-year pilot cap was $2,000; it's since been adjusted down to $1,500.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>185</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>We placed a cap on the amount we are willing to pay for an APC at $2,000, so while we have had applicants who have sought more (up to $5,200), we have only offered up to $2,000.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest</td>
<td>Lowest</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>650</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,045</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,226.24</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>Over the years the maximum amount faculty may apply for has been decreased as demand for the fund has increased.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,272</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>The limit for a single grant from the fund is $3,000 CAD.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,335</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,545</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>96.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Our records include amount allocated, not necessarily what the APC was. Discounts or requests for partial funds are not known for all years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>For papers with multiple authors, we cover APCs only for those authors affiliated with our university. We divide the fee evenly by the number of authors and pay for the university share.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>This is based on requested allotments, as that is how we interpreted the question. This doesn’t necessarily “map” to APCs that journals actually charge, which on average would be closer to the “highest” figure. There is substantial data already on APCs charged by publishers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>Approximation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>595</td>
<td>We have established a $3,000 limit per article.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>Average reimbursement per article = $1,266.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,200</td>
<td>119</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,200</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>Our funding limit per article is $1,500. If the APC exceeds that amount the author or author’s department has to make up the difference.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. How many requests for funding were received in FY16? N=27

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>34.31</td>
<td>33.00</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. How many articles were funded in FY16? N=26

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>27.96</td>
<td>24.00</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Received</th>
<th>Funded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
20. Were any requests for funding denied in FY16? N=30

| Yes | 27 | 90% |
| No  | 3  | 10% |

If yes, how many articles were denied funding in FY16? N=25

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21. Why were articles denied funding? Check all that apply. N=26

- Hybrid journals 21 81%
- Other sources of funding available (e.g., NIH, NSF grants) 11 42%
- Co-authors from other universities 2 8%
- Other reason 21 81%

Please briefly describe the other reason. N=21

- Article not completed.
- Fund over-expended by third quarter of FY16.
- Fund was exhausted for the fiscal year.
Hybrid or not listed in DOAJ
Illegitimate journals
Journal author agreement or licensing requirements did not meet our criteria.
Limit to one per fiscal year. First author from another university (though co-authorship is fine).
Not up to scholarly standard
One was a delayed-access model publication; two did not meet fund policy requirements.
Our aim is to have authors self-screen for eligibility. In order to submit a funding application, authors must check a box to attest to having no alternative funding, for example. Applications for hybrid journal APCs end up with the majority of rejections, because the “pure” vs. hybrid distinction is not necessarily obvious to authors. Having co-authors from other universities does not disqualify our authors from receiving funds from our program (we divide the fee evenly by the number of authors and pay for the university share).
Our fund was exhausted.
Out of money.
Predatory publisher, journal not listed in an OA directory, author submitted an article but it was not submitted for publication.
Problem meeting fiscal year deadline for submitting paperwork.
Request was withdrawn; article not accepted by journal; co-author had already received funding from OA fund in same fiscal year; publisher failed to meet fund criteria
Suspected predatory journals
The author is no longer affiliated with the university.
The request was actually for page charges, not APC.
There were a variety of reasons. In some cases the faculty member submitted an application for a hybrid journal, which was not allowed in this funding cycle. Faculty who had already been allocated funds reapplied, and there were several submissions for non-OA journals.
We looked for these qualities in a journal: The author retained their own copyright; the journal was fully open access; access was immediate, not delayed.
When an author uses their departmental card to pay for APC it disqualifies them from receiving reimbursement from the COAP fund.

22. **How many articles has the fund supported in total (since inception through FY16)?** N=29

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>957</td>
<td>106.90</td>
<td>75.00</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Articles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
23. Have any academic disciplines received more funding than others in FY16? N=28

Yes  28  100%
No   0   0%

If yes, which disciplines received the most funding in FY16? N=28

Sciences  28  100%
Arts and Humanities  0  0%
Social Sciences  0  0%

Comments N=10
12 of the 13 articles were from the medical sciences.
Biology
Especially medical and life sciences
Faculty of Health (especially kinesiology and psychology)
Faculty of Medicine (70% of funding); Faculty of Science (10% of funding)
Medicine
Sciences: 9; Social Science: 4; Arts & Humanities: 6

The majority of awards have been in the life sciences and engineering, but we have seen significant numbers in the social sciences and a few in the humanities as well. We have funded authors in a total of 33 academic departments/programs. Last year, on an experimental basis, we extended funding to authors of two OA monographs published in the Press's Luminos program. This year, we have revised our funding criteria to provide ongoing support for OA book publishing. We expect that this will help broaden the disciplinary reach of the program.

The sciences dominate funding requests. Only linguistics and law had applicants outside of the sciences.

Vast majority of applicants are from the sciences.

**APC POLICIES: ELIGIBLE AUTHORS**

24. **May any member of your institution’s community (including faculty, staff, students, researchers, postdoctoral students, etc.) receive support? N=33**

Any author affiliated with the institution may receive support 20 61%
Only specific categories of authors may receive support 13 39%

**If only specific categories of authors may receive support, please specify which category(ies). N=13**

All categories of authors (faculty, postdoc, staff, and graduate and undergraduate students) affiliated with the local campus may receive support. However, we do not currently extend support to authors affiliated with other campuses.

All except undergraduates
Current faculty member, instructor, post-doctoral researcher, staff member, or graduate student author. Faculty includes librarians.
Current faculty, post-doc, resident, or staff member who has had an article, book chapter, or book accepted for publication. Currently enrolled student or graduate student who has had an article, book chapter, or book accepted for publication.
Faculty and graduate students
Faculty, post-doctoral associates, graduate students.
Faculty, post-doctoral fellows, graduate students, librarians, archivists
Faculty, staff, and enrolled students
Full-time faculty members and research scientists
Our materials specify all members of the university community except undergraduate students. However, I believe that undergraduate proposals would be considered.
Standing and associated faculty
Tenure track faculty, non-tenure related career faculty, post-docs, currently enrolled graduate students
The author can be a faculty member, post-doc researcher, graduate, or professional student and any staff whose articles accepted for publication in a peer-reviewed, open access publication.

**Additional comment N=1**

[Any affiliated author, but] they cannot have received funding from elsewhere to publish.
25. Describe any members of your institution's community who are excluded from receiving support. N=13

Classified staff, undergraduates
Everyone besides the above
Former students, faculty, and staff
Graduate students, undergraduates, non-faculty
Hospital employees who are not also affiliated with the university.

Members of affiliated institutions who are excluded from COAP include: Barnard College, Teachers College, or Union Theological Seminary or Jewish Theological Seminary of America (JTS) are excluded from receiving support.

Nobody is specifically excluded, but undergrad researchers are not included; neither are temporary staff.

Staff members
The Health Sciences Library did not have formalized criteria for funding and considered each request on a case-by-case basis.

Undergraduate students
Undergraduate students; staff; faculty, students, post-doctoral fellows from affiliated colleges

Undergraduates
Visiting scholars, researchers who are part of institutes but are not affiliated with the university.

26. Are APC awards distributed or prorated among multiple authors? N=31

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, prorated among authors at the same institutions</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, both of the above</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, prorated among all authors regardless of affiliation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments N=10

Yes, prorated N=4

Each author will be responsible for a prorated portion up to a total per-article cap of $3,000.

Proration occurs if the authors request.

We have supported some papers with authors at other institutions, where the author had a previous but not current affiliation with the university. In those cases we have allowed the institution to fund the non-university authors' shares.

We prorate reimbursements based on the number of authors on a paper. Only university-affiliated authors are eligible for reimbursement.

No N=6

A university-affiliated author is eligible for up to $1,500 per year to be applied to a single paper. Multiple authors on the same paper don't matter. For example, two local authors wouldn't get $3,000 for a single
paper. But one of the two authors could apply for one article, and the other on a second article. The presence of an already-funded author wouldn't eliminate the paper from eligibility.

Awardees were eligible for up to $1,000 per year, and $1,000 per article. In the case of articles with multiple local authors, all authors were considered awardees and the $1,000 cap per article still applied.

Funds are distributed in a single award to the applicant (one applicant per publication). For papers with multiple authors, we can cover APCs only for those authors affiliated with the local campus (we divide the fee evenly by the number of authors and pay for the university share).

New guidelines are being drafted that address this.

Only first or corresponding author on a paper may apply for funding.

Only one author per article can apply.

### APC POLICIES: FUNDING LIMITS

**27. Is there a cap on the amount that will be funded per article? N=33**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**If yes, please specify the per-article funding limit. N=30**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>2,175</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,250</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,000 CAD</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments N=2**

$3,000 per article in a fully open access journal, up to $1,500 per article for hybrid journals and has a cap of one article per author per year.

New guidelines in draft specify a cap of $2,000 per single article.

**28. Is there an annual limit on the amount of funding an individual author may receive? N=33**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**If yes, please specify the annual funding limit. N=27**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6,000 CAD</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments** N=18

**Answered Yes** N=14

$3,000 per author per FY

$3,000 is the maximum any one applicant may be awarded in one year. There is a cap of one award per author per year.

50% of the APC for one article for up to $1,500. The amount of funding per article has been decreased as the popularity of the fund has grown.

Also maximum of two awards per lab per year

As funds allow, exceptions will be considered for requests above this annual cap.

Cap was $2,000, lowered to increase number of awardees.

Limit of two successful applications/year (instituted September 2015). Funding/application limits put in place in September 2015 in response to overwhelming demand for limited funds.

One article per author per fiscal year

One per author per year (but could be a co-author on another funded article)

Only one article for up to $1,500

Our limit is on the number of successful grants, rather than on the total amount of funding. So, an author may receive up to $6,000 CAD in funding, but most authors receive less, since many grants are for less than the maximum amount.

Preference given to authors who have not been previously funded.

The $3,000 maximum was based on the typical range for journal APCs. As mentioned above, we have recently extended the scope of our program to cover processing charges for OA book publishing. Of course, these fees are much higher than journal APCs, but we are maintaining the $3,000 contribution limit in order to contain our costs.

This was not formally codified, but in practice it was $1,0000 per article.

**Answered No** N=4

New guidelines in draft specify a cap of $3,000 per author per year.

One article maximum per researcher per fiscal year may be funded. We have refused for high costs but have no officially set maximum dollar amount limit.
There is no hard annual limit, but due to limited funds, the library has discretion to approve only one award per author per year from the fund. We have been considering limiting the funding in additional ways. For now, though, we only limit by the per-article cap.

**APC POLICIES: JOURNAL CRITERIA**

29. **Does your institution fund APCs in hybrid journals? N=32**

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Please briefly explain why your institution has made this decision. N=26**

**Answered Yes N=4**

But only at half the rate allowed for gold OA journals.

If a journal was hybrid or delayed access, then the approved amount went down.

The question did not come up, but we did not want to exclude any form of journal from the outset, but rather to make considerations on a case-by-case basis.

We want to provide as much support as possible to authors publishing in OA journals.

**Answered No N=22**

Double-dipping; low amount of money in fund each year ($15,000)

Hybrid journals were covered by the Open Access Author’s Fund for several years in cases when the publisher indicated they were reducing subscription costs in response to the take up of their hybrid open access programs. It was decided that there was not sufficient evidence that publishers were actually making these reductions, so the decision was made in 2014 not to continue funding APCs in hybrid journals.

If the Libraries has a paid subscription to a journal we would be paying twice if we paid to make a single article OA. Although for FY16 and FY17, as part of a special promotion to attract more authors from the humanities, we will pay hybrid journal APCs for authors affiliated with the College of Arts & Humanities. So far, we have had no applications for hybrid journals from this group.

In most cases the university already pays for subscriptions to the journals so reimbursing authors to publish in hybrid journals would effectively be paying them twice.

In the beginning we funded OA costs for hybrid journals, but as the fund became more popular, we eliminated that option.

It is a form of double dipping by publishers.

Limited funding, so we have to make choices. We choose not to support the hybrid journal economic model. Also, those OA fees are more expensive, on average and in the specific requests we’ve seen.

Our VP for Research provides funding for hybrid and delayed-access journals.

See other comments on the lack of set criteria. There was an inclination not to fund hybrid journal APCs, but there was no formal statement forbidding it.
Since we pay subscription fees for these journals from the collections budget and the OA fund also comes from the collections budget, paying for articles in hybrid journals is essentially paying twice for the same content. Also, there is no transparency and no obligation on the part of these publishers to lower subscription fees in proportion to the APC fees they collect.

The HOPE fund is our implementation of the Compact-for-Open-Access-Publishing-Equity, through which we carry out our mission to underwrite reasonable publication charges for articles published by faculty and researchers in all-open-access journals.

The Open Access Fund is a program to support our scholars who wish to make their journal articles openly available immediately upon publication, and to support gold open access publishers around the world.

The purpose of the fund is to increase OA and full OA publishing; and articles/books must be fully available open access at time of publication. It is also to prevent large commercial academic publishers from co-opting the Gold OA model by charging exorbitant APCs.

They do not contribute to the goals of open access.

We changed our policy during FY15 to suspend support for hybrid journals. We support fully open access publications.

We consider it “double dipping.” Seeing as we already paying subscriptions to the journals, we are not seeking to fund their open fees as well. We also want to discourage the hybrid model and therefore won’t support it.

We did until 2015; decision to stop was partly budgetary, partly philosophical.

We don’t consider the hybrid model a good practice to support. “Double dipping,” or paying twice for the same content, would hurt our budgets even more.

We don’t want to support publisher “double dipping,” and do want to encourage alternative business models that are fully open access for the reader.

We prefer to direct our support to publishers of fully open access journals, rather than those who are simultaneously charging authors for open access and libraries for subscriptions.

We want to incentivize publishing in, and support for, fully OA journals.

We wanted to support fully open access journals first.

If yes, do your guidelines require that the publishers reduce institutional subscription fees? N=4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

30. Do your guidelines require that journals be listed in the DOAJ (Directory of Open Access Journals) or other OA registry in order to be eligible for APC funding? N=33

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

31. Do your guidelines require that publishers be members of OASPA (Open Access Scholarly Publishers Association) or adhere to a similar code of conduct to be eligible for APC funding? N=33

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
32. Do your guidelines require that journals be peer-reviewed to be eligible for APC funding? N=33

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>23</th>
<th>70%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

33. What other criteria are used to evaluate publications for funding APCs? Check all that apply. N=20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beall’s List</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal Impact Factor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other criteria</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please briefly describe the other criteria. N=18

All journals that meet DOAJ’s criteria

All the above criteria were considered, but none were formally required. Another informal factor was staff assessment of the merit and need of the particular researcher and his or her access to other funds. For example, post-docs and assistant professors were more likely to receive funding than full professors. A requestor who had received funding in the previous year would be less likely to receive funding again in the near future.

Articles may not still be under review; they must be accepted. The journal is published in a fully open access format based on a published schedule of article processing fees.

Articles or books for which alternative funding is available are not eligible for reimbursement from this fund. This includes articles reporting research funded by a gift or a grant from a granting agency, foundation, or other institution (including the university itself) that allows grant funds to be used for open access publishing fees (whether or not the particular grant had budgeted for such fees), and articles funded by an institution that itself pays article processing fees on behalf of the author. An author must have exhausted all other grant and other funding sources to be eligible for this fund.

Beall’s List isn’t listed publicly as one of the criteria, but it’s something we check if there’s a question about legitimacy of a journal. Journal/publisher on Beall’s List doesn’t necessarily lead to denial, but if we can independently verify why a journal is included there, that will lead to denial of funding.

COPE, Directory of Open Access Books

DOAJ inclusion OR published by an OASPA member

Eligible journals must provide free, immediate, online access to the full text of research articles upon publication without restrictions. Eligible journals include those listed in the Directory of Open Access Journals, or publishers that are generally compliant with the Open Access Scholarly Publishers Association’s Code of Conduct. Journals must be peer-reviewed. Journals must make their standard fee schedules publicly accessible. “Hybrid” open-access publishing, such as subscription-based journals that make some articles available after an author pays fees are not eligible for funding. Any journals or publishers listed in Beall’s List of predatory scholarly open-access publishers require greater scrutiny by authors and the University Libraries.

Favorable author agreements in which authors retain the copyright to their work.

If we think the publisher may be predatory based on comments from Beall or other sources, we may advise the author to review their choice to publish with that journal.

Must allow posting in repositories without embargo; also review process, reputation, presentation, marketing techniques, acceptance rate, and other factors as needed.

New draft guidelines require that the journal be vetted by author’s department chair.
Publications must have a standard policy to waive fees in case of economic hardship.

There are significant concerns regarding Beall’s List. The Open Access Fund aims to encourage authors to retain copyright so they can release their work under Creative Commons licensing. For that reason, another condition of the Open Access Fund is that the journal must allow the authors to retain copyright.

We had one instance this year where a journal was not listed in DOAJ but the publisher was a member of OASPA. We funded that request.

We looked for these qualities in a journal: The author retained their own copyright; the journal was fully open access; access was immediate, not delayed.

We review each journal and publisher to ensure it’s ethical and not “predatory.” We search the Internet, including Beall’s List, to get informal feedback about faculty experiences with particular journals or publishers.

While we don’t require listing in the DOAJ, journals must conform to the DOAJ criteria in order to be acceptable. This avoids the problem of new journals not being listed yet, and the fact that the DOAJ was not being updated for several years.

**APC FUNDING PROCEDURES**

34. **To which department do authors apply for APC funding? Check all that apply. N=33**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of research</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual academic departments or colleges</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central budget office</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration (provost, president, or chancellor)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University press</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other unit</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

35. **In which department are APC invoices paid? Check all that apply. N=33**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual academic departments or colleges</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of research</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central budget office</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration (provost, president, or chancellor)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University press</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other unit</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

36. **How are APC invoices paid? Check all that apply. N=33**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Payment Method</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Author or author’s department pays, then is reimbursed from the fund</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit card</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deposit account</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other method</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please briefly describe the other method. N=13

APC is paid by author using their personal card. The university then reimburses the author (if they meet our criteria).
Currently making adjustments to allow for credit card payment.
Institutional reimbursement system—the same one used for payroll.
Interdepartmental transfer
Invoice processed through library’s finance department like an acquisition.
Payment can also be made in the form of a reimbursement through a departmental fund transfer.
Purchase order created in library finance department.
This depends on the publisher and whether the library is paying directly (preferred) or if the costs were paid for some other way and we have to reimburse the department.
University financial system (Kuali)
We try to encourage the author to have his/her department pay and we can easily transfer the money to that account. Pay the publisher directly with credit card is the next preferred form of payment and a check is issued only as a last resort (as a state institution this can take weeks if not months).
We used a variety of methods based on the needs of the author and the journal.
Wire payments
Wire transfer; in cases where the APC exceeds $1,500, we pay the full amount and the author’s department reimburses us the difference.

OUTREACH FOR PUBLIC AWARENESS

37. How is your institution’s community made aware that an open access fund is available? Check all that apply. N=33

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Library liaisons</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word of mouth</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Through related activities, such as Open Access Week or Open Education Week</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email list</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newsletter or flyer</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blog</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other method</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please briefly describe the other method. N=12

Because our grant was so modest, we deliberately relied on the liaisons for much of the advertising. In reality, word of mouth among researchers was the biggest factor in who applied.
Bookmark describing the Open Access Fund
LibGuide
Mentioned frequently as part of related outreach and presentations.
Outreach to Academic Senate Council on Research, Computing, and Libraries (CORCL)
Rotating slide on video displays in the library

The Faculty Council Committee on Libraries is comprised of representatives from all the colleges, and they have communicated to the colleges.

Through workshops for faculty and graduate students

Visits to Faculty Councils

We're finding that many publishers are listing institutions that have funds on their sites or they refer their authors to us. We find that we have to do little promotion and we end up using all funds long before the fiscal year ends.

We provide our data to SPARC, which includes the information in its annual report and on its website.

Workshops

38. Does your institution formally recognize authors who receive OA funds? N=33

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>36%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If yes, how does your institution recognize authors? Check all that apply. N=12

- Website: 7 58%
- Ceremony or event, such as during Open Access Week: 4 33%
- Annual report: 2 17%
- Library or institution marketing: 1 8%
- Other method: 6 50%

Please briefly describe the other method. N=6

In a collection of the supported materials in the institutional repository

In addition to listing their article on our Scholarly Communication website, we deposit their articles to our institutional repository.

OA-funded submissions are listed in the institutional repository under a specific heading of OA-funded articles.

Posting author names and article titles on a library website and providing links to their articles in the repository.

Through SPARC

We are planning an event to occur during this year's Open Access Week.

39. Is specific data about the fund shared openly? N=33

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>46%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If yes, please indicate how the data is shared. Check all that apply. N=15

- Institution or departmental website: 8 53%
- Annual report: 4 27%
Online spreadsheet 1 7%
Other method 7 47%

**Please briefly describe the other method. N=7**

Library blog
Monthly reports to the Scholarly Communication Committee, reports to the library liaisons
Occasional reports and blog posts; presentations to stakeholder groups (e.g., our Faculty Library Board)
Reports to the Faculty Council Committee on Libraries
Shared through the annual Canadian Association of Research Libraries statistics process since 2013.
Upon request. Also presented in a poster session at a conference.
We prepare reports as requested by the provost and the University Libraries Committee.

**APC FUND BEING PLANNED**

40. **In how many months will the fund be implemented? N=6**

   12
   24
   6–8 months

To be determined. This initiative depends on the availability of funding.
We are currently in discussions to determine the amount in the fund, how it will be distributed, policies, etc. We anticipate that we would implement the fund in the fall of 2016 or spring of 2017.
Within next 12 months

**NO APC FUND**

41. **Please indicate why your institution has no APC fund. Check all that apply. N=33**

   Lack of funding 15 46%
   Lack of administrative support 15 46%
   Lack of faculty interest 5 15%
   Other reason 16 49%

**Please briefly describe the other reason. N=16**

APCs are not particularly a cost-effective or scalable mechanism for furthering open access.
In general we have author interest but at the moment the TriAgency policy allows authors to use some grant funding for APCs so that may minimize the requests we receive.
Instead of “Lack of author interest” I would say it’s “lack of demonstrable author requests.”
It is for different reasons such as funding and the unsustainability of it, but the main reason is that we do not believe that this should be part of the mission of the library to pay for author’s APC.
More pressing priorities require attention at this time, however, there is author interest.
No requests for this have been made and therefore no funding sources have been explored. There are no funds in the library budget to pursue this.

Our library has, thus far, opted not to establish an APC fund for several interrelated reasons. Broadly speaking, these reasons can be said to fit the category of “the hybrid OA problem.” In other words, during a period of stagnating and contracting budgets, the library cannot justify redirecting funds from resources with clear, large-scale impact to an APC fund with uncertain or questionable impact. Our prevailing sense, as a library and more broadly as an institution, is that APC-funded Gold Open Access still presents substantial drawbacks for researchers and for libraries. The following list of drawbacks is excerpted from the “Report of the University of Illinois Open Access to Research Articles Task Force.”

There are many concerns about APC-funded Gold Open Access. For example: 1. The cost structure of APCs continues to be highly volatile, and varies widely in a manner not directly related to the quality of the journal. For example, in mathematics, APCs vary from $750 to $3,000 for reputable journals. 2. Subscription journals remain very important and active venues for publication of academic research, resulting in a situation where libraries cannot reduce subscription costs to cover faculty APCs without also reducing the number of subscriptions. Thus, APCs are a new and additional cost in the system. 3. Payment of APCs from authors to journals may create an incentive for a publisher to publish the work of those who can pay rather than publishing the highest quality research, thus lowering standards of publication. Indeed, we have seen the emergence of “predatory” or fraudulent open access journals that have no reputational value and capitalize on revenue from APCs. 4. Because of this extraordinary variability in quality of journals that receive APCs, an institutional commitment to APCs will also require institutions to review journals for quality, a practice that will be problematic and expensive.

Based on the above drawbacks, the task force tendered the following recommendations: 1. That the University of Illinois not adopt a university-wide policy on institutional support for APCs. 2. That the University monitor the adoption of APCs by Gold open access journals, as widespread adoption of this model will result in institutional support for APCs becoming an important component of competing with our peers. (Wilkin, John, Mary Case, Matthew Ando, Doug Beck, Danilo Erricolo, Anna Lysakowski, Joyce Tolliver, et al. “Report of the University of Illinois: Open Access to Research Articles Act Task Force,” October 15, 2014. pp. 15–16, 18. http://www.trustees.uillinois.edu/trustees/agenda/November-13-2014/r-OARAATF-and-Minority-110314.pdf). Thus, while the University of Illinois has adopted an open access policy, it has not mandated a specific route to open access, nor has it adopted a university-wide policy for supporting a specific route. Costs for any APC support funding would therefore be solely the library’s budgetary responsibility. The library continues to feel any viable approach to supporting journal subventions requires a systematic approach to categorizing and assessing each potential publication or external OA initiative for quality and potential contribution to establishing a true path to offsetting future library costs. A library study group will continue to assess external opportunities (especially larger-scale experiments like the Open Library of the Humanities, etc.) and recommend strategic investments based on rigorous criteria.

Some authors include APCs in grant applications and fund publishing via 3rd-party funding agencies. Some authors might receive APC support through their academic colleges, but this approach isn’t coordinated between colleges or formalized within colleges, but rather handled primarily on a case-by-case basis.

The library does not have plans to subsidize employees’ contributions to scholarly publications.

The University Libraries actively support open access. The decision to not support APC’s was made consciously, on principle.

The university is large, with decentralized centers of authority. APC funding on campus may be handled by units (departments, colleges) or via grants. The grant funding and APC climate varies substantially across disciplines, of course.
There is currently no centrally administered fund planned. Our current plan is for the deans to determine and provide appropriate APC funding. The criteria and processes are still being established and documented.

There is interest in creating an APC fund among librarians, faculty, and graduate students, but it is beyond the budget of the library and we do not currently have institutional support from university administration.

This is a topic that has been discussed but it hasn’t been determined where it belongs on this campus. We have several new upper-level administrators, including a new dean in the library, and an interest in increasing research funding so I expect the topic to continue being discussed.

We are currently investigating how this is being handled on our campus and the feasibility of supporting an APC fund.

We’ve not had many requests coming from faculty or students for help with APCs and we’ve not heard from our administration that this should be a library focus. At the same we believe that funding for APCs is going on but in a distributed way outside of library operations. The library does contribute to open access projects (SSRN, Stanford Encyclopedia, ArXiv, etc.) but we don’t currently support OA through APC funding out of library money.

**FUNDING OF EXTERNAL OA INITIATIVES**

42. **Does your institution allocate funds to OA initiatives that are external to the institution?** N=72

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>58</th>
<th>81%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**If yes, which initiatives are allocated funds? Check all that apply.** N=58

- Memberships (for example, PeerJ) 48 83%
- Open access monograph publishing 40 69%
- Journal subsidies (for example, Open Library of Humanities) 38 66%
- Open educational resources, such as textbooks 21 36%
- Other initiative 18 31%

**Please briefly describe the other initiative.** N=18

Also projects like SCOAP and Reveal

arXiv: We have a supporter membership for this preprint service. SCOPE3 supporter. We weren’t sure where HathiTrust fit into all of this since it is OA after the fact.

HathiTrust; OAISter

Knowledge Unlatched

Member of Open Access Network, Open Textbook Network

NB: These funds come from the Libraries’ collections budget and not from COPE funds.

OA Monographs: we have supported both phase 1 & 2 of Knowledge Unlatched. OER: as a member of the Boston Library Consortium we support the Open Textbook Network. Journal subsidies: we participate in SCOAP3.
Provide support to the Library Publishing Coalition (LPC), SCOAP3, and the Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, among others.

Reveal Digital

SCOAP, Knowledge Unlatched, CRL offering “Independent Voices”

SCOAP3 (2 responses)

SCOAP3 (same as journal subsidies?)

Support includes: PKP: we are a full development partner and so we offer both financial and human resources as part of our commitment; Knowledge Unlatched; DOAJ; Erudit; SCOAP; ArXiv

The Libraries are also involved with discussion on campus regarding Open Educational Resources, but have not allocated funds to this initiative at this point.

The Libraries is a supporter of general OA initiatives and specific publisher programs that include SPARC, arXiv, the Royal Society of Chemistry Gold for Gold Program, Knowledge Unlatched, Science Advances (AAAS), HathiTrust, Nucleic Acids Research, Reveal Digital, and BioMed Central.

We participated in the pilot and round two of Knowledge Unlatched, and we provide funding support for the SCOAP3 initiative, which will convert 10 key journals in the field of high-energy physics to open access at no cost for authors. We also provide funding support to arXiv.

While most of the fund is used to support journal articles, COAP fund administrators are willing to consider different types of open-access publications such as open-access conference presentations and monographs. For example, COAP fund resources were used to license a translation of a Dante text for use in the Digital Dante project, http://digitaldante.columbia.edu/ and to pay a nominal fee to a German publisher to maintain access to geoscience articles in our institutional repository Academic Commons, http://academiccommons.columbia.edu/.

Additional comment N=1

As previously responded, we have a lack of funding, but we would be interested in funding other OA initiatives like OLH, PeerJ, etc.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

43. Please enter any additional information regarding open access funding practices at your institution that may assist the authors in accurately analyzing the results of this survey. N=22

Authors apply individually to the Office of the Vice Provost for Research for funding for article processing charges.

For FY17 we are only funding 50% of an article’s fees, which is why the total amount for the fund has been reduced compared to FY16. In past years we have requested additional funds from the deans on campus and not all contributed. Since we tend to have a larger number of applications from the sciences, we wanted to make it more equitable across all college/schools. When we open up the application process in the fall we are going to encourage authors to reach out to their department heads and deans for additional funds as well as use grant funding if it is available. If the deans are not more receptive to the authors, at least they will be aware of how important the fund is to the researchers in their departments.

July 25, 2016 DRAFT / Kent State University Open-Access Publishing Fund Guidelines: The Kent State University Open-Access Publishing Fund will support reasonable article processing charges (APC) for open-access journals when funds are not otherwise available. The fund is supported by
University Libraries. Requirements Eligible Authors: The Open-Access Fund is available to any Kent State University faculty, postdoc, staff member, or student who is the lead or corresponding author. Eligible Articles: Funds apply to APCs for scholarly peer-reviewed articles. Eligible Publications: Are open-access journals that: § are approved by the applicants’ Academic Unit § Are peer reviewed § Are listed in the Directory of Open Access Journals § Have policies and practices consistent with the Open Access Scholarly Publishers Association Code of Conduct § Make their standard fee schedules publicly accessible § Waive their APCs in cases of the authors' financial hardship Not eligible: § Articles in journals that charge an annual subscription fee, including journals that use a delayed open-access model, or offer an “open choice” option to make a particular article open access. § The Open-Access Publishing Fund does not cover: Color charges, Page Charges, Illustration Fees, Submission Charges. Article Reimbursement Cap: Funding allowance for a single article is capped at $2,000. Author Reimbursement Cap: Authors may receive funding for up to $3,000 per year for all APCs. Unused amounts do not roll over to future years. § We encourage authors reporting on research that was supported by funders (e.g., NIH) to use research funds to cover publication fees. If possible the costs for APCs should be specifically included in the grant. Multiple Authorship: In the case of an article with multiple Kent State authors, they may opt to split the APCs among themselves. For example, for an article with three authors that is to appear in a journal with a $3,000 publication fee, each author could receive funding for $1,000 of that fee. Application Process: § Articles submitted for publication after July 1st, 2016 are eligible. § University Libraries will administer the fund and process APC payments. Main obstacle to APC fund establishment is institutional budget. The state government has instituted a budget recision this FY and state budget outlook is bleak for the next several years. If we had funding available, the APC project would have been implemented already.

Our support of external OA initiatives is funded through collections funding.

See analysis of the impact of our OA fund at “Library Funding of Open Access Publication Fees: Effects on Faculty Behavior and Attitude,” http://opensiuc.lib.siu.edu/morris_confs/22/


The fund has evolved over the years, so the answers that have been provided apply to the last round of funding.

The Open Access Author’s Fund was suspended from November 2015 until July 2016. A new and expanded funding model has recently been announced that includes contributions from the provost and individual academic departments in addition to funds allocated from the library collections budget. Another change in July 2016 is that responsibility for the administration of the OAAF is moving from collections staff to the recently hired scholarly communications librarian.

The statistics from the fund in operation for two years show that there is demand for this kind of fund and the pilot was a success from that perspective. Discussions are in process about how best to move forward and whether the OA Fund is the best approach.

The University of Alberta Libraries’ Collection Policy includes the following statement: “The University of Alberta Libraries are committed to the principles of open access, as outlined in the IFLA Statement on Open Access to Scholarly Literature and Research Documentation. In addition to collecting and making available open access materials, we are committed to furthering knowledge through online open access journal hosting, digital repository, and research management data management services. The Libraries are also engaged in ongoing digitization and digital preservation projects aimed at ensuring open access to historical material for current and future generations of students and researchers.” The Open Access page on the Libraries’ website routes to Open Access initiatives: https://www.library.ualberta.ca/research-support/open-access
The University Research Office has a Scholarship Facilitation Fund that awards grants of $2,000, a portion of which may be applied to OA publishing, but that is just one category among many, and not its primary purpose. http://research.uconn.edu/funding/scholarship-facilitation-fund/

There is currently no centrally administered fund planned. Our current plan is for the deans to determine and provide appropriate APC funding. The criteria and processes are still being established and documented.

UCI participates in the Royal Society of Chemistry “Gold for Gold” program http://osc.universityofcalifornia.edu/scholarly-publishing/open-access/uc-discounts/

We (the library) put together a proposal for a modest fund when the campus open access policy was passed and implemented. However, we were never able to get funding in the budget allocated for APCs.

We also participate in/subscribe to Biomed Central, Royal Society of Chemists, and SCOAP3, all of which enable our faculty to have article processing charges paid for or they will get a significant discount. We have created a special fund to incentivize faculty to replace commercial textbooks with alternate learning materials or open textbooks. We are applying for an NEH open humanities book program

We are working on greater recognition and transparency about the fund. This includes plans for a web page listing funded articles. Regarding the retrieval of funded articles, we are looking to change to a model in which authors are required to deposit their articles in the repository.

We have also used the fund to support our open education initiative https://scholarblogs.emory.edu/eoei/

We receive vouchers from publishers that we pass on (e.g., in the past Royal Society of Chemistry). Non-APC related: We expanded our institutional repository from ETDs only to accepting peer-reviewed OA articles. In other words we fund the IR and support author deposit into it. We fund events for Open Access Week in terms of staff time organizing events, expenses for speakers, refreshments, advertising of the events.

We review our policies annually and make adjustments.

We traditionally look at investment level, viability of model, and responsibly adding to the support of OA.

While the Libraries budget contributes funding toward a variety of memberships and programs that support OA publishing, these efforts do not revolve around a library-controlled APC fund mechanism. Our contributions tend to lead to cost reductions for authors, rather than direct dollar support.
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