

GCU Library Feb2013

***This collection of policies covers the publications section of the Pure Research Management System and the ResearchOnline@GCU research repository***

1. Content Policy
2. Submission Policy
3. Validation Policy
4. Deposit licence/agreement [provided in a separate document]
5. Embargo Policy
6. Take Down Policy
7. Copyright information for authors [relates to the take-down policy]

### **1. Research Output Content Policy**

The PURE system allows academic staff to record information on a wide range of publication/research output types. Academics are encouraged to add as much detail as possible to each output type in Pure. As part of the Pure training for academics, staff are given advice on how to add material that could potentially be included in the REF 2014 submission, eg. guidance on the essential fields required for adding information on journal articles. The validation policy (below) outlines the criteria for identifying publications for public display in the repository (via the Pure portal), while other output types can be viewed within the admin side of Pure for research information purposes. The principal language of the publication content in Pure is English, however the system can accept material in a range of languages.

### **2. Submission Policy**

Following the Pure training session academics with accounts in Pure will be able to access their individual Pure profile, and add metadata and full-text. The key route is by direct submission of content by academics (self-deposit route). Another option is for School administrators to add publication content on behalf of academics (mediated deposit route).

### **3. Validation Policy**

The Library is responsible for validating publications and research outputs submitted by GCU researchers.

Validation workflow: this involves checking and verifying the publication details provided by academic staff. This may require adding to and amending the metadata as required, to ensure accuracy of data and maximum potential for resource retrieval in the repository. If full-text is provided, the Library will check the version provided and publisher copyright. If the version of the document is permitted to be used in an institutional repository by the publisher, and no embargos are required, the document will be made available publicly when the record is validated.

**Only validated items will appear on the repository website.**

Validation criteria. Using the previous repository content policy as a guide, the validation criteria (Jan 2013) is as follows:

**Peer-reviewed publications, from 2008 onwards, of published status\*, and of the following content types: Journal Article; Editorial; Letter to the Editor; Book Review; Authored Book; Edited Book; Book Chapter; Conference Proceedings; Patent; Report.**

*\*In press status publications can be included also, if the details are available to check online, eg. early online view of articles, or if book details are available.*

Future validation option: possibility of validating earlier publications ie. 2007 and before.

#### **4. Author deposit licence/agreement (provided in a separate document)**

#### **5. Embargo Policy**

Where an author provides full text of a publication (post-print/author final draft, publisher version or pre-print) the Library will check the publisher copyright status of each item, using the Sherpa/Romeo service as the primary source of copyright information. Where an embargo is required by the publisher prior to it being made available in an institutional repository, the embargo date is added to the publication record in Pure by the Library. This will prevent the item from being made visible in the repository.

If available the DOI/link to the article online will be added by the Library as standard procedure, as an alternative means of accessing the full text. Users with subscription to the journal(s) will be able to view the full text online, until the embargo has expired.

## 6. GCU PURE Take-Down Policy

Where allegations are made about the academic content of research publications (e.g. plagiarism, misuse, misattribution or falsification of data) displayed in the repository, the University will (if it considers there is a reasonable justification) investigate such allegations according to the provisions of the Research Misconduct Policy.

### Upon receipt of a complaint, the University will:

- Promptly acknowledge receipt of the complaint and remove the document from public view, pending investigation. The aim is to acknowledge any complaints within 10 working days.
- Make an initial judgment of the complaint:
  - Where the complaint is judged to be invalid, University staff will respond to the complainant with details of the reasons why the complaint is judged invalid.
  - Where the complaint is judged to be valid, University will remove the item in question from the repository pending a fuller investigation.
- Where the complaint is judged to be valid, the University will inform the contributor who originally deposited the item concerned. University staff will endeavor to resolve the issue amicably and to the satisfaction of both the complainant and the contributor.
- Where the complaint is judged to be valid and cannot be resolved informally, the University will take legal advice as necessary. The complainant and original contributor will be advised of the outcome and of any action taken.
- If a complaint is upheld, the full-text will be removed permanently from the repository. A metadata record of the item may remain on display in the repository.

Complaints about any item that appears in the GCU research repository should be emailed to: [repository@gcu.ac.uk](mailto:repository@gcu.ac.uk) or alternatively sent to: GCU research repository, The Library, Saltire Centre, Glasgow, G4 0BA.

### The following details should be provided when making a complaint:

- Your name and email address
- The full title and description of the item concerned
- The URL of the item concerned
- The reason for the complaint (eg. copyright infringement, offensive material, academic plagiarism, misattribution, misuse or falsification of data)

FAO Library staff and Pure administrators:

### **Procedure for Library staff. Removing a document from public view in Pure**

If someone contacts the Library with a complaint regarding an item in the repository:

The Library should acknowledge receipt of the complaint within 10 working days. Please see above 'Upon receipt of a complaint'.

- Contact the relevant staff to inform them of the complaint (John Marshall; Marian Miller; Elinor Toland).
- While the complaint is being investigated, it is advised that the full text of the item in question be removed from public view. This can be done by a Pure Administrator/Editor of Publications, as follows:

Log into the Pure live system > Research Output > search for publication title. Edit the Documents field > set visibility of the document to 'Backend Pure users'. Add a comment in the Bibliographical Note section, eg. 'Removal of full text from public view pending complaint investigation, ET 18-3-13'.

Save the changes. Metadata for the item will still be visible for the publication in the repository, but the full text should no longer be available to download. This should happen immediately once the changes have been saved.

If the complaint is judged to be valid, the full text can be permanently removed from the Pure admin system by Library staff/Pure global administrators.

If the metadata is also to be removed from the website, a request can be made to the above email address and no record will remain of the publication on display in the repository.

## 7. Copyright information for GCU authors

Please note this is offered as a guide to copyright, and should not be relied on for legal advice.

### **Will publishers allow me to display my documents in the GCU research repository, ResearchOnline@GCU?**

Many scholarly publishers allow the archiving of full-text of research in institutional repositories. However, terms and conditions vary between publishers, and although most do allow archiving, **many will only allow the final author version rather than the formatted, publisher version.** Some publishers may allow the final author version, eg. after an embargo period. Authors can check which versions publishers allow for deposit, along with publisher copyright guidelines by using the [SHERPA/RoMEO](#) website\*.

### **How can I be sure that putting my work into the repository (via the Pure system) won't be a breach of copyright?**

The Library takes copyright matters very seriously, and takes every step to ensure that a breach of copyright will not occur.

\*The SHERPA/RoMEO service is used in the first stage of copyright checking. This database lists most of the major academic publishers and several society publishers. Based on the information provided by the publishers, the RoMEO database allows the Library to ascertain what the publishers will and will not allow.

Based on the version of the document uploaded by the author, the Library will decide if the document can be displayed publicly in the repository. To increase the number of documents available publicly in the repository, the Library encourages academics to upload the final author version, ie. the final, peer-reviewed version minus the publisher formatting and logos. There are a number of benefits to authors in making their research freely available in an institutional repository (open-access), including increased citation impact, accessibility and visibility.

### **What can I do to avoid problems with copyright?**

For published articles and papers, in most cases the author signs an agreement transferring copyright to the publisher. When submitting research for publication, you might wish to consider discussing an alternative copyright agreement with the publisher, eg. to include a statement about depositing in institutional repositories. A Licence to Publish is an alternative to the Copyright Transfer Agreement, and may allow authors to disseminate their research in institutional repositories.

It is good practice to keep an electronic copy of the final draft Word document of your research for submitting to the repository, as many publishers will allow the archiving of this version of an article.

### **Is there a repository 'Take-Down Policy'?**

Yes - if the Library is notified of a potential breach of copyright, or receive a complaint indicating a violation of publishers' rules or other relevant concern, the item involved will be removed from public display in the repository as quickly as possible pending further investigation. Where the grounds for complaint are considered plausible, the material will be permanently withdrawn from the repository. (N.B. This may take some time if it is necessary for Glasgow Caledonian University to seek legal advice to resolve the complaint). Complaints should be emailed to: [repository@gcu.ac.uk](mailto:repository@gcu.ac.uk) or made in writing to: GCU repository, The Library, Saltire Centre, Glasgow, G4 0BA.

### **Further information**

SHERPA/RoMEO service: <http://www.sherpa.ac.uk/romeo/>

Copyright advice from the GCU Library: <http://www.gcu.ac.uk/library/research/copyrightadvice/>

JISC Copyright Toolbox: <http://copyrighttoolbox.surf.nl/copyrighttoolbox/authors/licence/>