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**Financial Accountability**

1. **Expenditure by Publisher**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Publisher** | **Cost GBP (incl. VAT)** | **No. APCs** |
| ACM | 2636 | 3 |
| ACS | 28935 | 20 |
| AMS | 460 | 1 |
| AIP | 2642 | 2 |
| Am.Soc.Microbiologists | 4655 | 2 |
| ASBMB | 3460 | 2 |
| BMC | 5120 | 4 |
| BMJ | 2910 | 2 |
| Company of Biologists | 2400 | 1 |
| Copernicus Publishing | 2197 | 7 |
| Elsevier | 68222 | 37 |
| Emerald | 1194 | 1 |
| FASEB | 1534 | 1 |
| Frontiers Open Access | 1270 | 1 |
| ICE Publishing | 1536 | 1 |
| IEEE | 4939 | 5 |
| Interscience Publishers\* | 1825 | 1 |
| Int.Soc. Labor Law and Social Security | 0 | 1 |
| Int.Union Crystollagraphy | 736 | 1 |
| IWA Publishing | 2040 | 1 |
| Landes Bioscience | 936 | 1 |
| LMS | 4620 | 2 |
| Mary Ann Liebert\* | 1785 | 1 |
| National Academy of Sciences | 1412 | 1 |
| Nature | 18852 | 8 |
| OMICS Publishing | 1189 | 2 |
| Optical Society of America\* | 1123 | 1 |
| OUP | 12042 | 8 |
| PLOS | 13124 | 14 |
| Portland Press | 1800 | 1 |
| Research Media LTD | 2700 | 1 |
| Royal College of Psychiatrists | 3000 | 1 |
| Royal Society | 16260 | 12 |
| RSC | 31200 | 26 |
| Sage | 200 | 1 |
| Society for General Microbiology | 3255 | 2 |
| SPIE | 1718 | 2 |
| Springer | 8295 | 5 |
| T&F | 14590 | 8 |
| OSA | 850 | 1 |
| Wiley | 101908 | 60 |
| **TOTAL** | **379570** | **252** |

\*Publishers who refused to provide Open Access under a CC-BY licence

1. **Other Expenditure Analysis**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Other Expenditure 01/04/2013 - 31/07/2014** | **£** | **Description** |
| Staff Costs | 44 000 | 0.75FTE OA Coordinator role; 1FTE OA assistant |
| Infrastructure | 9 000 | Symplectic User Licence (links the university publications software to our repository) |
| Publishers (pre-payment schemes and membership schemes) | 105 000 | Wiley pre-payment top-up £100K April 2014; Royal Society 1 Yr Membership (entitles all authors to 25% discount on APCs) |
| **TOTAL** | **158 000** |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **TOTAL SPEND** | **£** |
| UoS Block Grant 2013-2014 | 490 000 |
| APC payments | -380 000 |
| Other expenditure | -158 000 |
| **BALANCE** | **-48 000** |

Our total spend on OA related activity during the period April 2013 to July 2014 is greater than our RCUK allocation of £490K. This is because although we have spent £380K on 252 individual APCs, some of the actual payments were deducted from pre-payment schemes set up with BIS money.

**Policy Compliance**

1. **Total number of RCUK funded papers published April 2013- July 2014**

Our existing publication/research systems do not capture funder data and correlate it with article metadata and OA status. Therefore we are currently unable to say how many peer-reviewed papers arising from research council funded research have been published by researchers from the University of Sheffield. We are awaiting a systems update which should allow us to link our grants information to our publications software (Symplectic).

1. **Compliance**
2. Number of articles made open access via the gold route

We have paid for 252 articles to be made open access via the Gold route with a CC-BY licence between April 2013 and 31st of July 2014. When staff time allows we check that the articles have been made open access with the correct licence. In March of this year a check found that 20% of articles had not been made open access as requested (and paid for). Most of these were rectified reasonably swiftly by the publishers concerned.

At the same time we also checked the copyright and licensing statements on 103 papers for which we have paid an APC. We found only about 60% of the articles had the correct CC-BY licence clearly visible on the article PDF. In some cases, discussion with the journal/publisher revealed that they were actually CC-BY but that wasn’t easily identifiable from the journal webpage/PDF. Some of the others were errors but some publishers were reluctant to alter the PDFs claiming it was either too difficult or ‘unethical’ to subsequently alter a published PDF. In a few cases we discovered the publishers simply refuse to use the CC-BY licence (at the time we asked). These are indicated with an asterisk in the table listing APCs paid by publishers . We now refuse requests from authors to use the block grant to pay for open access in these publications.

1. Number of articles made open access via the green route

The majority of authors who are using the green route to make their articles open access do so of their own volition and without involving the open access team. When depositing articles in our repository WRRO, they do not usually include information about funding in the metadata. Additionally many of them are using other repositories such as ArXiv, PubMed etc. This means we currently do not know how many RCUK funded articles have been made open access by the green route. We have been contacted by 6 people who have tried to make articles open access via the green route but due to the length of the publisher embargo period , these would not be RCUK compliant.

1. Overall Compliance rate

As we do not know how many RCUK funded papers have been published by University of Sheffield authors it is not possible to give an exact figure for our compliance rate. Therefore we have attempted to estimate it using data from Web of Knowledge and Scopus as described below:

Sample 1:

A search in WoS Core Collection for organisation= University of Sheffield and any RCUK funder acknowledgement with year of publication 2013 – 2014, returned over 700 records. 70 papers were chosen at random and checked for their open access status.   It was found that 33 were open access (27 gold, 6 green) giving a compliance rate of 47%.

Sample 2:

This search was repeated but only for articles published in 2014. 128 articles were identified that had a University of Sheffield RCUK funded researcher who was either the corresponding author and/or the principle author. Of these, 62 were open access giving a compliance rate of 48%.

A similar check was carried out on records from Scopus and this gave a compliance rate of 49%.

As these figures are so similar but are based on slightly different data sets they should be seen as a reasonable estimate of our compliance.