

General recommendations for research management in Australian universities

Authorship and IP policies

1. Clauses that determine authorship, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander authorship, and Indigenous Cultural and Intellectual Property (ICIP) rights should be incorporated into institutional IP Policies. Authors should not have to consider three separate policies to determine ownership of IP in publications.

University rights retention

2. Australian universities should adopt the strongest formulation of university rights retention. The IP Policy (and Enterprise Bargaining Agreements) should state that the university owns the IP and retains the right to use the work for education and research. This prevents universities from needing to pay publishers to provide open access that the university can provide with the infrastructure and rights it has retained.
3. Universities should cease the practice of asserting that the author is owner of copyright where the university retains a non-exclusive licence to use the work for teaching and research. Universities should also cease the practice of waiving ownership of academic publications.
4. Australian universities should adopt identical IP rights retention approaches in IP Policies that are compliant with OA mandates. Authors have neither the expertise nor the bargaining power to negotiate bespoke copyright terms. It is impracticable to require the big four STEM publishers (Elsevier, Springer Nature Group, Wiley and Clarivate) to tailor their interfaces to address the diverse Australian legal formulations designed to achieve effective rights retention. Transactional costs for all parties are reduced and a stronger sector bargaining position for universities would be secured through adoption of identical rights retention clauses in IP Policies.

Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Research Collaborations

5. To improve transparency and accountability to First Nations' Peoples, research publications and data based on knowledge shared from collaborations with First Nations' Peoples should include the names of First Nations' participants (including where applicable, as authors) in accordance with relevant community governance. In addition to noting relevant Ethics clearance information, the publication methods discussion should include an explanation of how researchers established who speaks for the community.
6. To enable a two-way knowledge framework and community archiving of research relationships there should be a formal requirement to make the research findings available in an understandable format to stakeholders in the community where the study was conducted. e.g. via a presentation, summary report.
7. Ownership of and access to research created by First Nations' authors and through knowledge sharing with First Nations' participants should be exempt from general university provisions that create university first ownership. Ownership and access to research should be determined in consultation with relevant participants, case by case and in accordance with applicable Ethics policies. A Creative Commons Attribution Non Commercial No Derivatives (CC BY NC ND) licence may be the most appropriate open

licence and provides much stronger legal protection than biocultural and Traditional Knowledge (TK) labels.

Publishing contracts

8. For appropriate contractual terms to be on offer to authors, universities need to approach the major publishers and communicate the legal requirements that flow from an Australian sector-wide approach to rights retention. This would reduce confusion for authors and minimise publisher transaction costs in administering author submission portals.
9. Australian universities should negotiate clauses that enable deposit of the published version (with publisher's copyright in the layout) of the research through the relevant institutional repository and support author self-archiving. It is impracticable to request authors to return to earlier unformatted copy to reinscribe late changes. Universities should strive to secure clauses that permit upload of the published version of the copy. Article Processing Charges (APCs) and transformative agreements (TAs), such as read-and-publish (R&P) or publish-and-read (P&R) agreements, are mechanisms that also facilitate OA with respect to the final published version. However, this charge may remunerate publisher contributions well beyond the market value of published edition copyright (the text layout, which is all the publisher owns), whilst discounting the free labour provided by the author, peer reviewers, editors and research infrastructure provided by the university and funders that underpin the reputation and commercial value of the journal.
10. Sector wide standard terms in publishing contracts entered into by employee authors with all publishers should explicitly state that the publication is not subject to an educational statutory licence.

Institutional repositories

11. Institutional repositories should make works available subject to a Creative Commons Attribution Non Commercial (CC BY NC) licence.

Research data and quality assessments

12. Universities and unions need to open up discussions about the longer-term implications of the creation of large data sets through privately owned academic research and social networking sites and advise employees about the potential uses and privacy implications of data generated through these interactions.
13. The Federal Government, research funding bodies and the Australian university sector should work together to decouple research quality assessments from Journal Impact Factor (JIF) and other metrics based wholly or partly on closed knowledge systems. Any research quality indicators should be based on open data, and may be guided by the Declaration on Research Assessment (DORA) principles that any quantitative indicators for research assessment should be clear, transparent, specific (rather than aggregate or composite), contextual and fair (in recognising and accounting for potential structural and personal biases that can be embedded and hidden in quantitative data).¹

¹ See. DORA, 2024. Guidance on the responsible use of quantitative indicators in research assessment. <http://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.10979644>.