

Capabilities	1 Envisioning & Initiating	2 Discovering	3 Designing & Piloting	4 Rolling out	5 Embedding
<b>Institutional Policy &amp; Strategy on OA</b>	We have not formally considered the need for policy in this area.	We are aware that the OA landscape is changing and are reviewing whether we should change our publishing practices.	We have reviewed our publication position paper / statement / policy. There is on going consultation with researchers and relevant support staff. We are aware of good practice internally and externally. We are discussing roles and responsibilities of relevant stakeholders in delivering services to support OA.	We have developed an OA policy and strategy, supported by relevant guidance. We have agreed roles and responsibilities of relevant stakeholders in delivering services to support OA. We are taking steps to communicate our OA policies and support.	Our OA policy, strategy and support has been well communicated to all stakeholders. We are confident that there is a high awareness of the OA environment, funding body and OA requirements for a future REF and the appropriate use of exceptions across the institution.
<b>Financing OA</b>	We have not formally considered the financial implications of OA for our institution.	We are currently reviewing the financial implications of OA on our institution.	We have decided to have a publication fund of £xxx. We are currently developing guidance on how the funds will be allocated.	We have developed a publication fund and have agreed a procedure on how it will be allocated. We are taking steps to communicate our OA funding policy to research staff.	We have a publication fund and policy of how it will be allocated. We have the technical processes and staff resources in place to manage all of this. We are confident that there is a high awareness of the application process for OA funding.
<b>Services for OA support</b>	We have not considered the services required for OA support or the areas in which those services may reside.	We are considering what/where support for OA may be best located and are considering what resources are needed to put this in place.	We have agreement on where/what staff will be available and have thoughts on how this could best be resourced. We are considering what training/development is needed for those staff.	We are either training, hiring or training and hiring staff to support OA and putting resources in place to continue the sustainability of the resource.	We have clear support for OA, both at Institutional, Faculty/Departmental and researcher level. We have resources in place to ensure that this support is adequately funded and we have processes in place to review the support to ensure that it continues to be fit for purpose.
<b>Capabilities: Systems and Processes</b>	<b>1 Envisioning &amp; Initiating</b>	<b>2 Discovering</b>	<b>3 Designing &amp; Piloting</b>	<b>4 Rolling out</b>	<b>5 Embedding</b>
<b>System to gather data for OA compliance</b>	We have not yet considered what systems / processes are required for us to monitor OA compliance.	We are investigating what systems / processes are required for us to monitor OA compliance effectively and efficiently.	We are developing systems / processes to monitor OA compliance, but have not yet fully tested them.	Systems and staff are in place to monitor OA compliance. The process has been communicated to research staff.	We have tested our system and know that it is robust and delivers all the information needed for compliance with HEFCE/RCUK/ Wellcome Trust/other requirements as they are currently outlined. Researchers know and understand how to use the system and we have checks in place to intervene if the correct processes are not being adhered to.
<b>Documentation/visibility of process</b>	We have not yet considered what documentation is required to support OA, or what form it might take and where it might be held.	We are considering the most appropriate form of documentation and the best way to make it available.	We are in the process of documenting OA processes.	We have drafted OA documentation. We are taking steps to communicate our OA documentation to research and support staff.	We have fully documented all processes, and procedures are in place to ensure these are kept up-to-date. The documentation is easily available/accessible.
<b>Reporting, monitoring and audit</b>	We have not yet considered what reports may be required or whether our systems will deliver the relevant data.	We have considered the kinds of reports that are needed and are starting to define these.	We are designing a suite of reports to meet management needs and to ensure compliance with funder mandates. We are testing our reports and ensuring that they are fit-for-purpose.	We have developed a suite of reports that allow us to monitor and manage OA compliance.	We have full, easily accessible reports which produce useful data on compliance with policies but also researcher engagement. We can produce data that demonstrates that compliance for audit purposes.
<b>Publication embargoes</b>	We have not yet considered ways to deal with publication embargoes.	We are aware of issues relating to publication embargoes and OA and are considering ways to overcome these.	We are defining procedures/ workflows and designing tools to meet the need to comply with embargoes.	We are testing our systems and workflows so that material is made available under OA as soon as possible.	We are fully compliant with current HEFCE/RCUK/Wellcome Trust/other requirements. We have tested that embargoes are managed in our systems and the correct metadata/full-text versions released to the public at appropriate times/in appropriate ways. Our processes are fully documented and we can demonstrate compliance to support any audit requests.
<b>Capabilities: Communication and staff development</b>	<b>1 Envisioning &amp; Initiating</b>	<b>2 Discovering</b>	<b>3 Designing &amp; Piloting</b>	<b>4 Rolling out</b>	<b>5 Embedding</b>
<b>Advocacy</b>	We have not yet considered the ways in which OA advocacy should occur across the institution.	We are aware of the need for OA advocacy and that different groups of researcher may require different methods of communication and training.	We are starting to develop and trial training and communication methodologies which cater for current information needs, but which will also be robust in the future.	We have developed a range of communication and training methods to cater for different groups. We have drafted a formal training and communication plan which we are delivering across the institution.	We have an agreed training and communication plan that can be responsive to changes in the OA environment and settled channels of communication that can effectively disseminate new information (eg changes/amendments to REF rules).
<b>Advice on where to publish in an OA environment</b>	We have not yet considered how to give advice to academic colleagues on where to publish in an OA environment.	We are considering the most appropriate way to support academic colleagues and are discussing with them the most suitable way to provide support and mentoring.	We are starting to draw up processes to support and mentor academic colleagues and identify the different kinds of advice and support academic colleagues may need at different points in their career on where to publish in an OA environment.	We have developed support and/or mentoring processes to support publishing in the OA environment. We will revise the support in light of feedback received. The issue is starting to be discussed more widely in discipline formal and informal channels.	Support and mentoring systems exist in all subject disciplines and it is clear to academic colleagues where/how to draw upon this advice. The issue is one discussed regularly in departmental meetings and in developmental reviews/appraisals/equivalent annual contact points.
<b>Impact of OA on research profile</b>	We have not yet considered how OA may affect our research impact.	We are reviewing possible implications of OA on impact in relevant fora and considering how to respond.	We are starting to design processes which will enable us to collate and analyse evidence of the impact of OA on the institutions research profile.	We are starting to trial ways/means to collect appropriate evidence relating to impact from access to OA outputs.	We have processes to consider/review/OA in terms of how it is affecting the research and significance of our impact. We can collect data about downloads etc. and other evidence that links accessibility of certain outputs to changes/benefits.
<b>Outputs eg books, non-textual and research data not yet OA</b>	We have not yet considered how to deal with outputs not covered by the HEFCE / RCUK / Wellcome Trust mandates.	We are starting to consider how to deal with outputs not covered by HEFCE / RCUK / Wellcome Trust and ways to move forward. We are talking to staff in those disciplines most affected by this.	We have draft policies in discussion with research staff and are starting to think about how our systems may need to be adapted to respond to these extra needs. We are developing training programmes for relevant staff so that they can respond appropriately.	We are working closely with researchers who produce research outputs in this category to ensure that their material is made OA as appropriate.	We have policies to guide staff on how to respond to these issues. We have processes and systems in place which can deal with most forms of open output or data. We have staff who can advise on the issues involved and we have documentation available to support researchers.

## WHERE CAN I FIND IT?

This resource is available from here <http://bit.ly/1EINIKY> and is licenced under **CC BY**



This license lets others distribute, remix, tweak, and build upon your work, even commercially, as long as they credit you for the original creation. This is the most accommodating of licenses offered. Recommended for maximum dissemination and use of licensed materials.

### Feedback

This is a pilot version so we are very keen of getting feedback on how it has been used in different institutions. How useful it is, how can we make it better?

### What Next?

We are looking at alternative ways of delivering this tool. We are also developing similar tool to be completed by individuals.

### More information

Visit our Blog: [sensemakingopenaccess.blogspot.co.uk/](http://sensemakingopenaccess.blogspot.co.uk/)

More about other pathfinder projects: [www.netvibes.com/sarahfahmy#General](http://www.netvibes.com/sarahfahmy#General)

## COMING SOON

### MIAO - MY INDIVIDUAL ASSESSMENT OF OPEN ACCESS

## CONTACTS

### Oxford Brookes University

Stuart Hunt [shunt@brookes.ac.uk](mailto:shunt@brookes.ac.uk) Project Director

Rowena Rouse [rrouse@brookes.ac.uk](mailto:rrouse@brookes.ac.uk) Project Manager

### Nottingham Trent University

Ruth Stubbings [ruth.stubbings@ntu.ac.uk](mailto:ruth.stubbings@ntu.ac.uk)

Cliff Neal [cliff.neal@ntu.ac.uk](mailto:cliff.neal@ntu.ac.uk)

### University of Portsmouth

Andrew Simpson [andrew.simpson@port.ac.uk](mailto:andrew.simpson@port.ac.uk)

Emily Bennett [emily.bennett@port.ac.uk](mailto:emily.bennett@port.ac.uk)

November 2014

**JISC** JISC OA pathfinder project  
'Making Sense - a researcher centred approach to funding mandates'

OXFORD  
BROOKES  
UNIVERSITY

NOTTINGHAM  
TRENT UNIVERSITY

University of  
Portsmouth

## Pilot version



## COLLABORATIVE INSTITUTIONAL ASSESSMENT OF OPEN ACCESS

Based on the CARDIO tool - [www.dcc.ac.uk/projects/cardio](http://www.dcc.ac.uk/projects/cardio) | **Oxford Brookes OA Pathfinder Prototype**

CIAO is a benchmarking tool for assessing institutional readiness for Open Access (OA) compliance. The tool is based on the CARDIO (Collaborative Assessment of Research Data Infrastructure and Objectives- <http://cardio.dcc.ac.uk>). This tool has been produced as part of the **JISC OA Pathfinder: Making Sense: a researcher-centred approach to funder mandates**. The project runs from June 2014 – June 2016 and will explore researcher behaviours using sensemaking techniques, trying to get researchers to comply with UK research open access mandates because they want to rather than having to. The lead institution is Oxford Brookes University, associates are Nottingham Trent University and University of Portsmouth.

## HOW CAN IT BE USED?

This version of CIAO is designed to be used in a workshop setting.

The workshop could be held at different levels in the organisation – institutional or at faculty, departmental level. It would require a Coordinator whose responsibility would be to gather together the key stakeholders involved in OA, publishing and research (maximum 20 participants) in their institution or faculty.

### Stage 1

Participants to work in smaller groups of 1- 4. Each groups should be made up of participants with different roles within the organisation eg. Senior academic, computer services, research support, researcher. Distribute a paper copy of the toolkit to each group, let each group make their assessments in discussion with the other members of the group. Each group should circle a box for each section which reflects where the group thinks the organisation is on the OA journey. Your circle can overlay two boxes if that better reflects your current position (allow 15 mins for this).

### Stage 2

A group discussion about the assessments with the aim being to come to some overall consensus. The final document could be used as an aid to change, acknowledging the institution's strengths and weaknesses and with an indication of what is required to maximise the institution's engagement in OA.

### Stage 3

Use the group discussion document and the original as reference documents to review progress towards the final stage, '5-Embedding' at a later date.

## WHAT MAKES A SUCCESSFUL CIAO WORKSHOP SESSION?

Consensus may not be possible if this a new way of working within your institution however the act of gathering people together and getting them to talk about OA can be a useful starting point to more meaningful discussions. It could always be used to review progress over a set time period.