OAPEN-NL
WP 3 – User survey and Evaluation
Research plan
1. Goal

The aim of the OAPEN-NL user survey and evaluation research is to collect, measure, monitor and evaluate the use of and users’ experiences of the Open Access publication model and the publication fund established for OAPEN-NL. This will provide knowledge on publication costs, funding models, the experience of users, procedures, criteria and standards. This knowledge will be used to devise guidelines and recommendations for Open Access book publications.

2. Details

The OAPEN-NL user survey and evaluation research has a dual design:

2.1 Quantitative

As soon as the publication fund is opened, the Project Group will begin evaluating its use. The research relates both to the applications submitted and the user and sales data. The quantitative research will therefore evaluate both the progress of the project itself (points 1 and 2) and the data relating to publications (points 3 and 4 – the use of the Open Access edition, including any possible impact on sales):

1) the number of applications received
2) the selection made from these applications
3) the user data (based on user statistics for Open Access publications)
4) the publication data (based on publishers’ reports)

2.2 Qualitative

The qualitative component of the user survey will examine both the experiences of users and their expectations of the OAPEN-NL publication fund.

Experiences: this part of the user survey will focus primarily on the experiences of users, defined here as academic authors and publishers, with the publication fund established by OAPEN-NL. This will involve an examination of the users’ experiences relating to the protocols established for OAPEN-NL (the financial aspects, quality control, etc.), the provision of information, the workflow and the service desk and the extent to which these correspond to the ‘normal’ practice, experiences and needs of users.

Expectations: this part of the user survey focuses on the expectations and perception of users with regard firstly to the project itself and secondly to the publication of monographs in Open Access. An examination will be made of the authors’ expectations with regard to quality, access and impact, sales figures, etc.
3. Methodology

Continuous collection of data by means of the following:

3.1 Quantitative research

The aim of the quantitative research is to measure the impact of publishing in Open Access. This will involve an examination of the online dissemination of content: are Open Access titles more frequently found and consulted than comparable titles not published in Open Access. Other factors will also be measured, including sales figures and quotations. The quantitative research is intended to provide an answer to the question of whether publishing in Open Access has a positive effect on the sales of titles and whether the improved accessibility also results in more frequent quotation.

This research will be conducted using the titles submitted in combination with a control group. When submitting an Open Access title, the publisher will also be asked for at least one title for the control group. This title must meet the following requirements:

- The subject must be the same as the subject of the Open Access title
- The title must not have been published more than five years before the Open Access title
- The circulation must not differ from that of the Open Access title by more than 25%

In order to measure online dissemination, all titles will be made accessible via Google Book Search, with varying levels of accessibility. The Open Access titles will be given maximum accessibility: this means that the full content will be visible via Google Book Search. The titles in the control group will be given minimum accessibility: this means that 10% of the content will be visible. This will make it possible to measure whether fully accessible titles are more frequently found and consulted than titles that are not fully accessible.

The effect of Open Access on sales figures will be measured in terms of the number of titles sold during the evaluation period. If a publisher sells both a paper and electronic version of the title, all the sales figures will be included. If possible, there will also be an analysis of the differences between the sale of the paper and electronic versions of the title.

Quotations will be measured using Google Scholar. The number of quotations from the Open Access titles will be measured at the end of the evaluation period. The number of quotations from the titles in the control group will be measured at the start and at the end of the evaluation. The difference between these two figures will then be used for the evaluation.

3.1.1 Project evaluation

1) The number of applications received

A measurement will be made of whether sufficient applications are received and whether sufficient grants have been awarded. From a financial perspective, an assessment will be made of the extent to which the applications correspond to the amounts awarded (an average of €5000 per book) and the retrospective calculation.
2) The selection made from these applications

This will involve an assessment of whether the quality of the publications meets the criteria set and whether the publications submitted meet the requirements relating to the legal framework and the technical specifications. There will also be an assessment of whether there is a balanced mix of academic disciplines and publishers by means of an examination of the nature and origin of the publications.

At various assessment points, these evaluation reports will be discussed by the Steering Committee and by the Monitoring Committee. At each of the assessment points (three times during the project) a series of criteria (number of applications received, the cost of publishing in Open Access, the quality and IPR criteria and technical requirements) will be applied to determine whether the pilot requires modification (procedures, application criteria, dissemination, funding).

3.1.2 User and publication evaluation

3) The user data (based on user statistics for Open Access publications)

Evaluation of the statistics on the number of downloads and views of the Open Access monographs in the OAPEN Library and on other platforms.

4) The publication data (based on publishers’ reports)

Financial and sales data based on the publishers’ reports and protocols developed in WP2.

The quantitative research will focus on measuring the effects of the use of several dissemination channels and increased accessibility on the impact of academic books. An analysis of the data acquired will be used in order to investigate the impact of the Open Access publication of academic books on their use and on the number of times they are quoted. In addition, the data acquired from the publishers’ reports will be used to assess the extent to which the sales figures have increased for both the paper and (where applicable) the electronic version of the academic books published in Open Access.

This data relates to fifty to sixty books that will be made available in Open Access on a range of different platforms (OAPEN Library, Google Book Search program, institutional and specialist repositories, publishers’ websites, etc.). This data will be compared with the control group of similar books, provided by publishers, which have not been made available in Open Access but which are offered via the usual sales channels.

3.2 Qualitative research

---

1 This research will apply a methodology previously used in a similar case study conducted by Ronald Snijder for Amsterdam University Press. See: Snijder, Ronald (2010), ‘The profits of free books: an experiment to measure the impact of open access publishing. Learned Publishing 23 (4): 293-301.
3.2.1 Survey:

An online survey will be developed in two different forms, one for academic authors and one for publishers. The surveys will be completed by the publishers and authors concerned after a book has been submitted and approved for inclusion in OAPEN-NL. In principle, each publisher or author need only complete the survey once. The survey is a compulsory part of the reporting procedure for publishers.

It will focus both on the experiences and expectations of authors and publishers. A number of elements will be examined in particular:

- Experiences relating to the models and protocols developed within the project:
  - Calculating the costs of Open Access books
  - Funding the publication costs
  - Guidelines for publication in Open Access and Quality Requirements for Open Access book publications
  - The legal framework for Open Access
  - The technical framework for Open Access book publications

- Experiences relating to the other components of OAPEN-NL
  - workflow
  - provision of information in advance
  - selection criteria
  - the service centre

- Expectations with regard to the publication of monographs in Open Access, concerning quality aspects, accessibility and the impact, funding and sale of monographs and the efficiency and effectiveness of the model applied within OAPEN-NL.

Part of the user survey is an analysis of the expectations, perceptions and standard practices of the users of the publication model and the publication fund, as presented in the OAPEN-NL project. Here, the users are defined as publishers and authors. In order to investigate the expectations and perceptions of users with regard to Open Access for academic books in general and the model presented in the OAPEN-NL project in particular, a methodology will be applied that was previously used in the OAPEN user survey. This survey applied a conceptual framework to represent the key characteristics of the formal academic communication system, based on a list of the most important values guaranteed within this system (quality, access and dissemination, effectiveness and efficiency, reputation and reward, economic feasibility and trust). The aim of this part of the qualitative research is to investigate the position of users with regard to these values and the extent to which they expect the publication of academic books in Open Access and the specific model applied in the OAPEN-NL project to have an effect on these values.

The surveys will also be part of the interim evaluation and final evaluation.

3.2.2 Workshops

---

Two workshops will be organised, for authors and the publishers involved. The first will take place at the start of the research in order to gain an impression of the effectiveness of the protocols developed and the prior expectations. The second will be held at the end of the project period in order to gain an impression of final experiences with the protocols and workflow developed and assess the extent to which initial expectations have been modified (under the influence of user experiences and quantitative data received relating to use, accessibility and impact).

**Workshop 1:**
- **Who:** publishers
- **When:** month 8/9
- **Objective:**
  - To provide input on the protocols and workflows developed in order to make any necessary changes
  - Further discussion of the Open Access edition calculation model
  - Assessment of expectations and requirements at the start of the project.

**Workshop 2: (possibly to be held in two sessions)**
- **Who:** academic authors and publishers
- **When:** month 21
- **Objective:**
  - Evaluation of the protocols and workflow used in order to develop general recommendations and guidelines for the final report.
  - Assessment of expectations and requirements at the end of the project.

### 3.3 Reporting and evaluation

There will be two interim evaluations of the data collected so far for the quantitative and qualitative research, based on the table below. The pilot (guidelines, procedures, criteria) may be modified in the light of these evaluations. A report will be issued for each evaluation. This data will also be included in the general project evaluation described in point 3.1.

At the end of the project period, a final evaluation report will be compiled, based on the user information from the qualitative research and the user experiences and expectations that emerged from the qualitative component (surveys and workshops). The final evaluation will be based on the evaluation reports referred to above and a final report which examines the experiences of those involved and the operation of the procedures and regulations in more detail. The final evaluation of the project will be compiled by the Project Group and submitted to the Monitoring Committee and the Selection Committee. The final evaluation aims to develop guidelines and recommendations for Open Access book publications. These will be compiled in a public report intended for the academic community. The research will provide knowledge and recommendations on publication costs, funding models, the experience of users, procedures, criteria and standards. Where possible, there will be international knowledge sharing and coordination in order to achieve standardisation and
ensure widespread application of the results. This applies particularly to a similar project in United Kingdom: OAPEN-UK.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIMING</th>
<th>FACTORS FOR EVALUATION</th>
<th>WHICH QUESTIONS NEED TO BE ANSWERED?</th>
<th>METHOD(S)</th>
<th>CRITERIA FOR SUCCESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01-04-11</td>
<td>Quality of publications</td>
<td>Does peer review system meet requirements?</td>
<td>Reporting on peer review system</td>
<td>At least 80% meets the requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01-06-11</td>
<td>Legal framework for enabling access</td>
<td>Does the IPR policy meet the requirements?</td>
<td>Check applications</td>
<td>At least 80% meets the requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technical specifications</td>
<td>Do the publications meet the specifications?</td>
<td>Check applications</td>
<td>At least 80% meets the requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overview of applications</td>
<td>Are there sufficient applications? Are there sufficient awards?</td>
<td>Overview of applications</td>
<td>20 awards after six months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nature and origin of publications</td>
<td>Which academic disciplines? Which publishers?</td>
<td>Overview of applications</td>
<td>Sufficient spread</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Financial contribution</td>
<td>What is the ratio of applications to awards?</td>
<td>Financial reports</td>
<td>€5,000 per book covers the costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Retrospective calculation</td>
<td>What is the relationship between the number of applications and the retrospective calculation?</td>
<td>Publishers' reports</td>
<td>Less than 10% discrepancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>User information</td>
<td>How many downloads? How many views?</td>
<td>User statistics</td>
<td>Average of 10 downloads per week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sales figures</td>
<td>How many copies of printed editions sold?</td>
<td>Publishers' reports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01-12-11</td>
<td>Quality of publications</td>
<td>Does peer review system meet requirements?</td>
<td>Reporting on peer review system</td>
<td>At least 80% meets the requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01-01-12</td>
<td>Legal framework for enabling access</td>
<td>Does the IPR policy meet the requirements?</td>
<td>Check applications</td>
<td>At least 80% meets the requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technical specifications</td>
<td>Do the publications meet the specifications?</td>
<td>Check applications</td>
<td>At least 80% meets the requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overview of applications</td>
<td>Are there sufficient applications? Are there sufficient awards?</td>
<td>Overview of applications</td>
<td>40 awards after one year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nature and origin of publications</td>
<td>Which academic disciplines? Which publishers?</td>
<td>Overview of applications</td>
<td>Sufficient spread</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Financial contribution</td>
<td>What is the ratio of applications to awards?</td>
<td>Financial reports</td>
<td>€5,000 per book covers the costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Retrospective calculation</td>
<td>What is the relationship between the number of applications and the retrospective calculation?</td>
<td>Publishers' reports</td>
<td>Less than 10% discrepancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User information</td>
<td>How many downloads?</td>
<td>User statistics</td>
<td>Increasing average number of downloads per week</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales figures</td>
<td>How many copies of printed editions sold?</td>
<td>Publishers' reports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Final evaluation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality of publications</th>
<th>Does peer review system meet requirements?</th>
<th>Reporting on peer review system</th>
<th>At least 80% meets the requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Legal framework for enabling access</td>
<td>Does the IPR policy meet the requirements?</td>
<td>Check applications</td>
<td>At least 80% meets the requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical specifications</td>
<td>Do the publications meet the specifications?</td>
<td>Check applications</td>
<td>At least 80% meets the requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overview of applications</td>
<td>Are there sufficient applications? Are there sufficient awards?</td>
<td>Overview of applications</td>
<td>60 awards after 18 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature and origin of publications</td>
<td>Which academic disciplines? Which publishers?</td>
<td>Overview of applications</td>
<td>Sufficient spread</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial contribution</td>
<td>What is the ratio of applications to awards?</td>
<td>Financial reports</td>
<td>€5,000 per book covers the costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retrospective calculation</td>
<td>What is the relationship between the number of applications and the retrospective calculation?</td>
<td>Publishers’ reports</td>
<td>Less than 10% discrepancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User information</td>
<td>How many downloads? How many views?</td>
<td>User statistics</td>
<td>Increasing average number of downloads per week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales figures</td>
<td>How many copies of printed editions sold?</td>
<td>Publishers’ reports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Users’ experiences</td>
<td>What are the experiences of the end-users?</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>70% positive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4. Quality management

The evaluation will be discussed with the Monitoring Committee. The pilot (guidelines, procedures, criteria) may be modified in the light of the evaluation. Any adjustments to quality management will be submitted for approval to the Selection Committee. The Selection Committee will be consulted if the selection criteria are modified.

### 5. Risk analysis

Risk management is an integral part of the OAPEN-NL project. Where necessary, risk assessment methods and evaluations will be applied in order to minimise any discrepancies between the expected results and the time schedule determined in advance. Risk management will take the form of interim planned project evaluations which enable the project to be modified where necessary.
Insufficient interest from authors

- Promotion of the scheme via project partners and active efforts on the part of participating publishers to recruit authors.
- Possibly target young authors who are less resistant to new developments.
- Highlight the academic impact of Open Access: global reach, greater numbers of readers, more rapid distribution of ideas and greater impact expected.

Insufficient number of publications at academic level

- Assessment by means of peer review
- Clear focus on the quality of the publications included, even if this is at the expense of the number of publications selected.

Insufficient interest from publishers

- A range of academic publishers are already associated with the project. The OAPEN network ensures that increasing numbers of academic publishers become aware of the possibilities.

Decline in the numbers of technical staff at publishers

- The OAPEN platform is embedded in the infrastructure of the University of Amsterdam, with all the support that offers.

Insufficient feedback from publishers and authors

- The survey and the publisher's report must be completed in order to receive the publication contributions.

Loss of data

- Use of stable platforms and ICT environments

6. Distribution of tasks

- Quantitative analysis: Ronald Snijder (AUP)
- Qualitative research: Janneke Adema and Ronald Snijder (AUP)
- Reports: Project Group

7. Activities and time required
- Compiling project/research plan (Ronald, Janneke, Eelco, Marnix): 3 days
- Monitoring and analysis of user data (downloads & views) (Ronald): 3 days
- Monitoring and analysis of publication data (sales etc.) (Ronald): 3 days
- Compiling surveys (Ronald and Janneke): 2 days
- Analysis of and report on surveys (Ronald and Janneke): 3 days
- Setting up workshops (Ronald and Janneke): 3 days
- Holding workshops, reports and analysis (Ronald and Janneke): 4 days
- Conducting interim evaluations and analysis (Ronald and Janneke): 4 days
- Writing interim evaluations/reports (Project Group)
- Writing final evaluation/report with recommendations (Project Group)

Total: 25 days

8. Planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.1</th>
<th>Instigating research</th>
<th>4-10-10</th>
<th>31-12-10</th>
<th>Evaluation plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Workshop 1</td>
<td>01-06-2011</td>
<td>01-07-2011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>Evaluation 1</td>
<td>01-04-11</td>
<td>01-06-11</td>
<td>Evaluation report 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>Evaluation 2</td>
<td>01-12-11</td>
<td>01-02-12</td>
<td>Evaluation report 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Workshop 2</td>
<td>01-06-2012</td>
<td>01-07-2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>User survey (analysis)</td>
<td>01-07-12</td>
<td>30-09-12</td>
<td>Reporting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>Final evaluation</td>
<td>01-07-12</td>
<td>30-09-12</td>
<td>Final evaluation report</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Survey design

For publishers

- Questions relating to the protocols (project description, selection criteria (quality/peer review and nature/origin), calculation model (funding and calculation), technical and legal specifications
- Questions relating to the workflow (application procedure, approval of applications and determination of publication contribution)

For publishers and authors

- Questions relating to the provision of information and the service desk
- Questions relating to expectations (expectations with regard to Open Access within OAPEN-NL in terms of accessibility, impact, quality, use and sales)
- Questions relating to Open Access and requirements (perception) (need for electronic publications, the importance of different values [including quality indicators] operation of existing model)
Appendix: additional documentation

For publishers:

- Project description
- Application procedure
- Selection criteria
- Approval of applications and determination of publication contribution
- Survey
- Application form
- Publisher’s report
- Statement of approval by publisher
- Calculation model for the costs of Open Access edition
- Specifications for submission
- Contract

For authors:

- Project description
- Survey