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OA@ULg: Why?

- Economic reasons

Explosion of costs
Budget increase: soft or nil!

Serial price increase compared to the evolution of life cost (on a base 100 in 1993)

Based on 70,000 titles (profit and non profit publishers) (source: Swets)
OA@ULg: Why?

- Economic reasons

- Ethical and philosophical reasons
  
  « All publications stemming from Research financed by public money should be freely accessible! »

  => Change the model!

- Strategic reasons
  
  - Available faster
  - More visible
  - More cited

- Perfect agreement between the University Top Management and the University Library Network Management
OA@ULg

PoPuPS: portal for the diffusion of ULg OA journals (since 2005)
http://popups.ulg.ac.be
- 14 journals currently
- > 4,000 articles available
- > 400 downloads/day excluding robots & spiders)

Financial support to publication in OA journals (BMC, PLoS One, ...)

BICTEL/e: repository of doctorate theses (since 2006)
http://bictel.ulg.ac.be
- 750 theses (63% with free full text)
- Massive access: > 200 downloads/day

ORBi: Open Repository and Bibliography for ULg
http://orbi.ulg.ac.be/
Open Repository and Bibliography

- One system, two objectives:
  - Complete institutional bibliography
  - Institutional OA Repository
- Respect for everyone (author, publisher, Institution)
  - Open Access
  - Restricted access when required by publisher
- Deposit by ULg authors themselves
- Institutional Mandate
The ULg mandate

November 2005: decision

May 2007: definition of a 'strong' mandate by the ULg Board

- All publications by all ULg members MUST be deposited
- All articles since 2002 MUST be full text
  - Open or restricted access according to the Publisher's policy
    (ID/OA: immediate deposit – optional access)

- A strong incentive: only those publications that are in ORBi will be taken into account in any evaluation, promotion, grant submission, etc...
Convince?

- Resistance:
  - « Academic freedom »
  - Poor understanding of OA
  - « A tedious task »

- Strengths:
  - Official strategic institutional issue
  - Coherent discourse and acts
  - Work with key actors
    - Pilot groups
    - Pick any opportunity (evaluation by EUA, assessments, etc…)
  - Development of a tailor-made tool

- Actions
  - Intense Communication mostly by the Rector (blog…)
  - Direct link in University on line address/phone book
  - « Hit Parade » of deposits, visits and downloads
Development of ORBi: more than a technique, a whole concept

- Put the **author** at the core: **concerned** AND **responsible**

- **Reduce constraints**
  - Work sharing between ULg authors
  - User-friendliness
  - Think over the whole deposit process

- Pre-import & import (PubMed, WOS, Scopus, Nasa, EndNote, BibTex...)

- **Coaching:**
  - Automatic and contextual help
  - Users’ guides
  - Legal help
  - Training
  - Interactive Hot Line
Development of ORBi: more than a technique, a whole concept

- **Transversality**
  - Links to sources

- **Value-added Services**: **maximise benefits**
  - Long term storage
  - Statistiques, metrics (IF, IF5, Eigenfactor, citation indexes, h-index…)
  - By-products
    - Reports (adapted to disciplines)
    - ‘Widget’ for personal pages
    - ...
  - Management of ‘request a print’
  - Coordination with Funding Agencies

- **Communication**
  - ORBi News, institutional publicity
  - ‘Flyers’
  - ORBi Mails: « buzz effect »!
Development of ORBi: more than a technique, a whole concept

- Be VISIBLE! => referencing
The role of the « back office »: Quality Control

- Authors concerned and responsible

- **But :**
  - Suppression : only by the ORBi team
  - Tools for redundancy detection
  - Tool to follow the « in press », « in progress », imports, ...
  - Permanent updating of the periodicals data bank
  - Hot Line exploitation to improve the system and the help
  - Tool for incoherent data detection
  - Targeted comparisons with WOS, Scopus, ...
  - Tools for false full text detection
  - Faulty behavior warned to author by the Rector himself
First reactions at launching (november 2008)

- Not a revolution!
- Some isolated negatives reactions.
  - Coherence and firm stand by Authorities
  - No exception
- Fear of the workload
- Submission
- Positive reactions of those who realised quickly that they would be provided with a superb bibliographic tool
  - importance of associating both objectives
- Positive reactions of early OA supporters
- Lots of questions asked
4 years later...

- Still no revolution!
- Steady swarming...
  - Resistent became enthusiasts
  - The message is spreading well
  - References ORBi more and more utilised (communications, web sites, ...)
  - ORBi has become a natural part of ULg
  - Lots of Full Texts beyond the mandate
  - Request to deposit publications by people gone or deceased
  - Some indirect and passive reluctance still, some evasion strategies

- But this is not the end!
  - Still too many confusions
  - New people
  - Authors’ rights negociations
Results: Evolution of the deposits

On average:
- > 60 additions/day
- > 60% with FT
Results:
Evolution of the deposits

Maximum per year not yet reached

ULg researchers publish more than expected

A lot of work remains for previous years *

(*): However exhaustivity for these previous years is impossible (researchers’ mobility, retirement, perception of the level of importance and of urgency...)
Results:
Evolution of the deposits

Each year, deposits are made earlier

Number of references published and deposited the same year
Results:
Evolution of the deposits

- 32,700 ‘peer-reviewed’ articles out of 38,000 (86%)
- 3,154 ‘peer-reviewed’ communications out of 3,790 (83%)
- 47,992 ‘peer-reviewed’ documents of all types out of 86,124 (55.7%)
ORBi in 2012
Is Access Open?

The proportion of OA deposits is constantly increasing.
It reflects:
• a better compliance with OA principles
• fears tend to disappear
• authors become aware of OA advantages and benefits
ORBi in 2012
Better reach?

Excluding spiders:
1.9 million views
980 K downloads
2012: 1,400 downloads/day

Including spiders:
>8 million views
>2 million downloads

Downloads of documents --- with extrapolation
ORBi in 2012
Better reach?

Mean number of downloads for 2008-2011 references
(measured May 2012 on 359,257 downloads of 18,536 references with FT)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Downloads</th>
<th>Downloads ULg</th>
<th>From outside ULg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open Access</td>
<td>39.60</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted Access</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18.1 times more
30.4 times more
Résultats
Bénéfices : plus cités ?

Mean number of citations for ALL 2007-2011 references on WoS
(n=7673  Data January 2011)

Selon WoS : proportion de références 2007-2001 jamais citées
• Présentes sur ORBi : 28,9 %
• Absentes sur ORBi : 55,8 %
What’next ?

- Développement
  - Keep the timing (ORBi 2.0, …)
  - Updating
  - Face the expectations (widgets, imports, statistics…)

- Convince the reluctant (e.g. those not concerned with promotions)

- Enroll the eldest

- Deal with the publishers, respect the « good » ones

- Develop new and fair assessment tools
Et encore...

- Keep up the quality
- Face the evaders with diplomacy
- Keep reminding the university community about ORBi
- Moderate enthusiasm (selectivity !)
- Keep up with search engines
Proselytism ?

- National and international recognition
  - ROAR (among >1,900 Institutional Repositories:
    - 22nd worldwide in size
    - 1st worldwide in average growth speed (10-100/day)
    - 13th in fast growth speed (>100/day) (1st for months)
  - Webometrics :
    - 41st worldwide out of 1,522

- Belgian universities have adopted our mandate but
  - Without the incentive
  - Work done by librarians : little involvement, low responsibility feeling
    \[ \Rightarrow \text{UCL} : 25.3\% \text{ FT} \]
    \[ \Rightarrow \text{ULB} : 16.4\% \text{ FT} \]

- Many requests for presentation of ORBi and the ULg mandate worldwide

- Agreement with the University of Luxembourg » : « ORBi.lu »
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