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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](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](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/](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:**
  - **Intense Communication** mostly by the Rector (blog...), prior to the launching in 2008
  - **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**
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...
  - Resistents 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 negotiations
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...)

Deposit on ORBi by publication year

Exact level? (7500/year)
Expected level...
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)

- Downloads: 39.60
- Downloads ULg: 3.16
- From outside ULg: 1.20

- Open Access: 39.60
- Restricted Access: 3.16

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 2007-2011 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
    ⇒ UCL : 25.3% FT
    ⇒ ULB : 16.4% FT

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

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