

Executive Summary: Jisc UK ORCID Consortium Members Survey 2017

A survey was undertaken of UK ORCID Consortium member institutions from 14th March to 5th April 2017 to assess the progress of members in adopting and integrating ORCID iDs and to gain feedback on the Jisc UK ORCID consortium support service. All members were given an opportunity to respond to the survey, including an extension to allow extra responses.

There was a high level of participation – 63% of members took part. The respondents were mainly senior staff, many at director level, from a variety of departments including policy, administration, libraries, research support, repositories and information services. This shows the importance placed on implementing ORCID by UK consortium members.

The survey found significant variation in terms of progress made with respect to implementing ORCID in the broadest sense, with 51% still planning or in development. In terms of integration, **23** institutions had completed an integration with 3 members in the process of upgrading their current integration.

Systems issues around integration were the most significant challenges identified, together with technical skills to support ORCID integration. Within the total response rates for each issue, there was a wide variation in response, for example in the area of buy in by researchers.

In terms of integration with other institutional systems and processes (CRIS, institutional repositories, HR, directory, student registry and website), there are good signs of progress, mostly in relation to Symplectic, CRIS and PURE, but a significant number of institutions have no integration or are working manually. Few institutions use other systems to store ORCID iDs. Elsevier PURE and Symplectic Elements are the main systems used to create or connect ORCID iDs. Other integration points of note are that: 22 have systems where ORCID iDs are displayed; 12 have systems where permission is obtained to write to or update a user's ORCID record; 18 have systems where information is ingested from the ORCID record.

Most members have a dialogue with system suppliers on integration (11 in discussion with Symplectic Elements, 11 with Elsevier PURE, 9 with EPrints, 5 with Clarivate Analytics/Converis, small numbers with Worktribe, DSpace, Researchfish). There are mixed views on supplier responses. This is flagged up as an area where members would appreciate more support.

The survey showed that some members are adopting a much more proactive approach to future plans, using video tutorials and integrating ORCID with other systems, for example, whilst others are taking a more passive approach, waiting on a variety of issues, such as how researchers view the usefulness of ORCID and overcoming technical obstacles.

In terms of approach to organisation, institutions have generally not appointed a project manager for ORCID implementation. Many institutions have a steering group overseeing ORCID but that is not usually their sole focus. Typically the library/information services or research services department is leading on ORCID implementation. Institutional approval has largely been sought from research committees, but also Pro-Vice Chancellor/Dean, or senior management. A significant minority of members who responded had consulted with their HR department or legal services. Most members have not encountered difficulties securing approval; however, some expressed concern that problems may arise at a later stage and some have already felt this. Cost may be an issue for some, while for others, the worry centres on practical benefits of ORCID. A convincing

business case has smoothed the path in some cases, but there have been divergent views between different departments on who should pay or whether it should be a priority. Senior support has clearly helped, but examples of successful practice could also be persuasive.

Members have used a variety of advocacy and communication tactics for promoting ORCID – mostly training sessions, but also email campaigns, via intranet and website, promotional material, leaflets and banners. One member mentioned the value of a blog to demonstrate value to ORCID users. Another found a competitive approach to numbers of ORCID registrations between different parts of the institution worked. In the majority of cases, there was no mandate for ORCID, but some said it was being considered and 7 institutions have already mandated use.

One member suggested that linking ORCID to external policy necessities such as the REF would be a good way to secure take up. Only a few had linked ORCID to a specific system or process (PURE, CRIS, Symplectic) or calendar event. One had made it necessary for applicants to provide ORCID iDs to apply for an internal funding scheme; another is trying to connect it to induction.

Most (35 respondents) have dedicated web pages to explain ORCID to researchers. A number of useful examples were supplied and have been added to [the member details spreadsheet](#) on the UK ORCID support website.

Most (24 respondents) felt it was too early to comment on benefits, but some identified early benefits such as:

- “Much more accurate information on publications and research activity. We have found it a useful source of truth for checking against other sources of information.”
- “Reduction in staff time spent entering publication details manually.”
- “Better engagement from researchers - helped me to build relationships as I offer to import people's publications.”
- “Increased repository deposit.”
- “Improved visibility of authors and outputs.”
- “Better awareness of academic publishing requirements.”
- “Better onboarding for new academic staff.”

In terms of anticipated benefits, interoperability and, on the back of interoperability, the ability to track outputs more effectively, were together the biggest anticipated benefits. ‘Disambiguation of works’ scored relatively highly. There is also an expectation by some that REF 2021 (and other bodies) will require the use of ORCID.

Nearly all respondents (just under 84%) were aware of the support service website. Most felt that the resources on it were useful, particularly for helping to make a business case for ORCID. Technical support was also valued but there were specific suggestions for how it might be improved.

The majority of respondents were aware of the Jisc UK ORCID help desk; but 8 replied that they were not, suggesting that some awareness raising is still required. Most respondents (60%) had used the help desk and most felt positive about the timeliness and helpfulness of the support provided. The handful of negative responses are being followed up to understand the specific issues. The offer of a 1:1 call was introduced later so most respondents had not been offered a call. Those who have not had a call are being offered one. Most respondents had attended a UK consortium members event. Most found it useful to share experiences, best practice and ideas for dissemination; technical

sessions were also valued. Of the suggestions for other event topics, some are being covered in the members event on 16th June 2017 and suggestions for other events have been noted.

Overall, the Jisc UK ORCID support service is largely deemed to be proactive/very proactive, but attention needs to be paid to the nearly 24% of those who felt it could be more proactive.

Members said they would like help with ideas for advocacy. Some respondents were particularly keen for more support on integration with other systems. Also a suggestion that Jisc might be more proactive in persuading system suppliers to facilitate integration. There is some dissatisfaction on the part of a small number of members related to specific issues around integration, which is being followed up. On a positive note, members reported successes in assisting research-active staff registering for an ORCID iD and there is enthusiasm for further developing the ORCID community.

Overall, the survey reveals positive progress with integration and general satisfaction with the support service, but there are specific issues that need further work. The survey suggests a great deal of enthusiasm and collective will to make this work in the UK, but there is a small number of institutions who have been disappointed with progress towards what they want to achieve. Perhaps this is unsurprising given that, although the principle behind ORCID is simple, the actual path towards being able to identify researchers uniquely and use this information across the world's research systems is complex. The Jisc UK ORCID support team recognises the need both to be realistic about the expectations created and to improve communications with UK consortium members, with our colleagues at ORCID, as well as with system suppliers, publishers and funders. There is clearly work to be done but a positive platform on which to build.