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EUA has about 850 members based in 48 countries.
Priorities in Open Science and Open Access

Key objectives:
• Sharing of research-generated knowledge
• Quality of research and research ethics and integrity
• Transparency of the research process and publication of results
• Easy and affordable accessibility to research publications and data

Conditions:
• Investment in Open Access business models (cost of publications)
• Investment in e-infrastructure (deposit and access – FAIR principles)
• Policies fostering Open Access to research publications and data
• Researchers motivation and careers
Percentage of Open Access publications (Gold and Green) by year on total

Source: Consortium's own analysis of Scopus and Unpaywall databases

Open Science Monitor, 14/10/19
Publishing models – open access and subscriptions

Policies for research publications (institutional, national, supra-national, e.g. Plan S)

Scholarly quality and research assessment

RDM and FAIR research data +
Scholarly publishing: EUA asks European Commission to investigate lack of competition

06 November 2018

The war to free science

How librarians, pirates, and funders are liberating the world’s academic research from paywalls.

By Brian Resnick and Julia Belluz | Updated Jun 10, 2019, 9:18am EDT
Illustrations by Javier Zarracina

European university heads take the fight to publishers

Vice-chancellors are leading contract negotiations, allowing universities to make more demands on open access and costs

timeshighereducation.com

Denmark’s universities ask Margrethe Vestager to add scientific journals to her hit list - CBS WIRE

Anne M. Lykkegaard Journalist
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And after that?
Key information

Data collection
August-November 2018

Respondents
31 Consortia in 30 countries negotiating on behalf of the university sector and other higher education and research performers

Focus on five major publishers
Elsevier, SpringerNature, Taylor & Francis, Wiley, American Chemical Society (ACS) – periodicals only

Most data refers to big deal contracts ongoing in 2017 or 2018
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€1025.25 billion

Periodicals €726.35 million
72% covered by universities

Other resources €289.90 million


Other publishers €251.08 million

Numbers not including:
• Article Processing Charges (APCs)
• Consortia other than those participating in the Survey
• Individual institutional contracts with publishers
Data for 31 consortia in 30 countries

Note: Data for 29 consortia.
### Do current big deal contracts include specific provisions for Open Access? (n=31/31)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provisions for OA</th>
<th>Currently (%)</th>
<th>In the future (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, only for green Open Access</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, only for gold Open Access</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, for both green and gold Open Access</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When APCs and subscriptions are included in the same contract, is there any provision or policy to prevent “double dipping”? (N=6/6)

- Yes: 67%
- No: 33%

### Are APCs and subscriptions included in the same contractual framework? (n=30-31/31)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APCs and subscriptions in same contract</th>
<th>Currently (%)</th>
<th>In the future (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No (subscriptions and APCs in different contracts)</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not yet decided</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When APCs and subscriptions are not included in the same contract, are there any monitoring systems in place to collect data on the funds spent on APCs? (N=16/17)

- Yes: 31%
- No: 69%
Main points of concern for higher education and research institutions

- Cost control: 81%
- Cost reduction: 65%
- Inclusion of subscriptions and Open Access provisions in one agreement: 65%
- Maintain content (journals) across contracts: 58%
- Early termination rights: 42%
- Preservation and access via local, consortium or national infrastructure: 32%
- Set embargo periods in accordance with funder requirements on regional, national or European level: 29%
- Service-level agreements on Open Access services provided by publishers (e.g. CC-BY): 26%
- Provisions for text and data mining: 26%
- Number of open access articles in hybrid journals (as a percentage of total articles published): 16%

*Number of respondents: 31/31. Multiple-choice question.*
Last year of contract
(n=126)
Big deals expenditures (million €) for periodicals based on the last contract year

(n=126)
Study on Read-and-Publish Agreements

Main questions

• Are R&P agreements a preferential way forward for universities and consortia?

• How do different stakeholders see themselves if R&P deals are the standard?

• What are implications of R&P agreements (costs, access to publishing services, vendor lock-in...)?

Details

• Cofunded by 26 organisations including EUA

• Running until beginning 2020

• Conducted by Technopolis (NL)
Addressing research assessment
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EUA Roadmap on Research Assessment in the Transition to Open Science

EUA BRIEFING
Reflections on University Research Assessment
Key concepts, issues and actors

Dr Rong Suwann Dr Leslie Bonnell-Diaz
April 2019

The European University Association and Science Europe join efforts to improve scholarly research assessment methodologies

2019 EUA Workshop on Research Assessment in the Transition to Open Science

14 MAY 2019 | WORKSHOP
UNIVERSITY FOUNDATION | BRUSSELS, BELGIUM

EUA - VSNU conference on recognition & rewards systems for academics

15 NOV 2019 | CONFERENCE
ROTTERDAM, NETHERLANDS

Take part in the EUA 2019 Open Science/Access survey on research assessment

The survey is now closed.
2019 Open Science survey on research assessment

**Objective**
Gather and share a comprehensive and up-to-date overview of research assessment practices in European universities, as well as plans to review these evaluation approaches, specifically in the transition to Open Science.

**Participation**
- 260 valid institutional responses
- 32 European countries
Which types of academic work matter most for research careers?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>Unimportant</th>
<th>Of little importance</th>
<th>Moderately important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Very important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research publications</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attracting external research funding</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research impact and knowledge transfer</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching activities</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research collaborations within academia</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research collaborations outside academia</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research supervision activities</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research networking</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring activities</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social outreach and knowledge transfer</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other types of research output</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Science and Open Access</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of responses: between 191-195/197
How is academic work evaluated for the purpose of research careers?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Moderately important</th>
<th>Of little importance</th>
<th>Unimportant</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Metrics measuring research output based on number of publications and citations</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualitative, peer-review assessment</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research impact and knowledge transfer indicators</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metrics measuring collaborations within academia based on co-authorship</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Science and Open Access indicators measuring the open accessibility of research outcomes and data</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altmetrics measuring the societal outreach of journal publications, books, reports, data and other non-traditional publications based on downloads, tweets, news mentions, etc.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metrics measuring academic attention and uptake based on number of views and downloads</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of responses: between 194-195/197
Metrics measuring research output based on number of publications and citations

- Journal Impact Factor (JIF): 75%
- h-index: 70%
- Field normalised citation index: 39%
- SCImago Journal Rank (SJR): 31%
- CiteScore: 25%
- Source Normalized Impact per Paper (SNIP): 9%
- Eigenfactor: 5%
- Don’t know: 4%

Multiple-choice question
Number of responses: 185/186
Outlook and open questions
Open questions

- Will ‘transformative’ agreements be more affordable than the traditional subscription model?
- Are transformative agreements cementing inequalities or even make things worse?
- Should scholarly publishing be in the hand of commercial publishers?
- What will be the impact of Plan S?
- Who is funding the transition?
- ...
Outlook

**Publications during Open Access Week 2019**
- Results of the Research Assessment Survey
- Report on Big Deals Landscape (“Decrypting Big Deals”)

**Other activities**
- EUA - VSNU conference on recognition & rewards systems for academics – Rotterdam, 15 November 2019 ([https://t.co/p9o9o1FkhZ](https://t.co/p9o9o1FkhZ))
- ... and interest from more national rector’s conferences to take it forward
- Ongoing study on read-and-publish agreements coordinated by EUA – expected publication of results early 2020
- Continuous dialogue with Coalition S, OA2020 etc.
Thank you for your attention
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#BigDealsReport