As Professor Michael Levine-Clark stood at the podium presenting, he made a simple but insightful statement:

“The time has come to find an automated solution to monitor our open access research.”

In his role as Dean of the University of Denver Libraries, Professor Levine-Clark had been grappling with a problem his librarian audience understood all too well — that monitoring public access to federally funded research had reached a critical point. By 2017, D.U.’s steadily growing research budget was approaching $30 million. Professor Levine-Clark knew that a considerable portion of this money came from various government agencies, representing a risk to future funding. He also knew that using the Library’s two and a half full-time developers to build and maintain a D.U. technical solution would take up too much of their valuable time.

Having handled a number of confused inquiries from researchers about the mandates arising from the OSTP “Public Access Memo” in early 2013, University of Denver Libraries Associate Dean Jack Maness was already very familiar with the funder mandate landscape. Like most librarians, he had watched the lack of single, standard U.S. Government mandate turn into a morass of many. Add to those the individual institution mandates that had developed over the years and Dean Maness and his staff found themselves facing a daunting task: chasing down the individual mandates associated with D.U. published research funded by multiple agencies and/or authored by researchers from multiple institutions. “It would not be unheard of for us to have research funded by two or more agencies with co-authors from two or three institutions. In a case like that, compliance with various mandates that differ in terms of embargo period, acceptable version and acceptable archive locations is confusing. This situation has the potential to frustrate D.U. researchers who are trying to do the right thing,” he stated.

In mid-2017, Professor Levine-Clark volunteered University of Denver to be one of the first institutions to participate in a beta test of CHORUS Institution Dashboards. For years, CHORUS has been working with agencies and publishers to establish a simple, automated and affordable open access monitoring solution that increases the possibility of meeting funder compliance mandates.

The first surprise for the University of Denver Library staff was that the Institution Dashboard was able to easily indicate how many publicly funded D.U. articles should be tracked. “We are a smaller research institution with around 500 articles indexed in Web of Science annually. Even that comparatively smaller number is hard for us to track, so we were happy to find out from our Dashboard, at a glance, that we had approximately 250 articles we should be monitoring — something we couldn’t easily determine before,” Dean Maness stated.

Once he and his staff started delving deeper into the Dashboard data, they noticed that only ~11% of the nearly 250 articles were publicly accessible on publisher platforms. They wanted to know why so few were available. They also wanted to know if the articles were available elsewhere.

What D.U. Librarians did next was very resourceful. They proceeded to download the data from the Dashboard and match it up with internal data that allowed them to see, by department, where the reported research was archived. This enabled them...
University of Denver Librarians downloaded the data from the Dashboard and matched it up with internal data that allowed them to see, by department, where the reported research was archived.

To help each individual department, researcher or campus administration start tracking their archived articles to make sure the version and the location were in line with the mandate of a particular funder and/or institution.

A closer look at a sampling of 71 articles reported that 44 (62%) were publicly available, meaning the remaining 27 (38%) might not comply with mandates in terms of archive location and version — if they had been archived at all. In addition, 17 of the articles were found in 66 different locations, indicating the potential for multiple versions being placed in multiple archives. And some may have been publicly available, but technically embargoed, so they were possibly out of compliance, as well. Most importantly, the Libraries now knew exactly where the reported research was archived and could start to determine if D.U. authors were compliant.

University of Denver Librarians are now in the process of reaching out to individual faculty members and graduate students to better understand self-archiving behaviors and underlying motivations. They feel the data suggests D.U. researchers are unaware of, or very confused by, mandates — particularly with respect to which version (author accepted manuscript, publisher version of record, etc.) should be deposited. They are also uploading their papers to archives that may not ensure compliance, if at all. The Libraries want to help. “This is not high on the priority list of many researchers at the University, and we don't want it to be,” said Dean Maness. “Their role is to research. Ours is to ensure that the results of that research are as widely available as possible, now and for future generations,” he continued.

“As librarians, we want to do what we can to help shoulder what could be considered an administrative burden, because it aligns with our values as a profession: providing access to knowledge that benefits humanity.”

The University of Denver found the Institution Dashboard so effective at helping monitor compliance of their federally funded research, they signed a contract for subscription in early 2018.