

**University of Cambridge  
Open Access Project Board**

**Minutes – 7 March 2017**

---

Meeting held at 14.00 – 15.30 on Tuesday 7 March 2017  
Syndicate Meeting Room, The Old Schools

Present:

- Professor Chris Abell, Pro-Vice-Chancellor for Research (Chair)
- Dr Martin Bellamy, University Information Services
- Professor Alan Blackwell, School of Technology (user Needs Committee representative)
- Dr Matthew Day, Head of Open and Data Publishing, Cambridge University Press
- Professor Abby Fowden, Head of the School of Biological Sciences
- Professor Lindsay Greer, Head of the School of Physical Sciences
- Dr Peter Hedges, Head of the University Research Office
- Dr Danny Kingsley, Head, Office of Scholarly Communication
- Professor Peter Mandler, School of the Humanities and Social Sciences
- Professor Richard Prager, Head of the School of Technology
- Dr Juergen Wastl, Head of Research Information
- Dr Nicholas White, School of Arts and Humanities
- Helen Jones, Research Strategy Analyst, Research Strategy Office (joint Secretary)
- Dr Marta Teperek, Research Operations/University Library (joint Secretary)

Apologies:

Professor Duncan Maskell, Senior Pro-Vice-Chancellor  
Professor Chris Young, Acting University Librarian

Declarations of Interest: No new declarations were made.

---

**1. Minutes of previous meeting (31 October 2016) and matters arising – OAPB-72**

The draft minutes of the meeting held on 27 July 2016 were approved (OAPB-72). Actions from that meeting were complete or to be discussed during the meeting.

**2. Matters arising – report on actions from the last meeting (31 October 2016)**

- a) Item 3a. Communication strategy for Wellcome Trust grant holders was included as part of the Open Access Project Report (OAPB-74)
- b) Item 3b. Revised draft of the Open Access Policy Framework was attached for comments (OAPB-73)
- c) Item 3c. Danny explained the progress of the Future of Academic-led Publishing Working Group and reported on the survey about training offered to researchers who are journal editors at Cambridge. 70% of respondents felt that they received sufficient training and 30% felt that they did not receive adequate training. Survey results would be published as a blog post. It was concluded that this might be something that the working group would like to explore in more detail.
- d) The Chair informed the Project Board that the results of the Planning Round application for the Research Data Management Facility were still unknown.

### **3. Draft Open Access Publications Policy Framework – OAPB-73**

The Chair introduced the revised draft of the Open Access Policy Framework, to which no further comments were received.

**Action: Secretary to forward the revised Policy Framework to RPC.**

### **4. Open Access Project – OAPB-74**

Danny Kingsley highlighted the key points from the Open Access Project report (OAPB-74).

a) HEFCE compliance.

To achieve compliance with the HEFCE policy, manuscripts needed to be deposited in the institutional repository within the 3 months from the publication date. However, it was expected that HEFCE would use 3 months from the acceptance date in the next Research Excellence Framework exercise. Therefore, compliance rate with the HEFCE policy was measured with regards to acceptance date, and was stable at around 50% level.

Danny explained to the Project Board the compliance graph from OAPB-74. The Project Board discussed the origins of the 700 publications per month compliance target number. It was explained that the target comes from historic data (2011/2012) and was based on estimates from Symplectic Elements. The group discussed the difficulty with the accurate assessment of what should be the monthly 100% target, especially taking into account disciplinary differences and that many publications from AH/HSS disciplines were not indexed by Symplectic Elements. Additionally, the Project Board discussed that particularly for researchers from AH/HSS disciplines, it was crucial that all publications were compliant with the HEFCE policy, as all of them might be important for REF submissions.

Personalised reports on HEFCE compliance prepared by the Office of Scholarly Communication for the School of Technology proved to be an invaluable tool for internal compliance benchmarking and also for targeted discussions with the faculty members. Generation of tailored reports required a substantial amount of manual data curation and processing by members of the Office of Scholarly Communication. Upon full integration of the repository with Symplectic Elements, tailored compliance reports would be readily available from Symplectic Elements and could be used systematically by other Departments and Schools to monitor and to increase compliance rates.

b) RCUK block grant update

Danny Kingsley raised the issue that only 10% of funds were left in the RCUK block grant, which was insufficient to cover the Article Processing Charges (APCs) expenditure until August 2017, the expected date of the next grant payment. The Project Board discussed whether APCs should now be paid only for publications in fully Open Access journals, or whether the University should underwrite the expenditure for all RCUK publications with the expectation that more money would be eventually made available to the University from RCUK. It was agreed that the University would accept this liability and underwrite RCUK APC charges provided that re-assurance from RCUK is received that additional funding would be made available, and that the University's Planning and Resource Allocation Office (PRAO) agreed. If the re-assurance from the RCUK was not received or if the PRAO did not approve the overdraft, APCs would be paid only for publications in fully Open Access journals (as agreed in item 2.4 of the OAPB minutes of 23 July 2015).

**Action: Peter Hedges to draft an e-mail to RCUK's CEO requesting re-assurance about future block grant allocation.**

**Action: The Chair to send out the e-mail to RCUK's CEO.**

**Action: The Chair to discuss the matter with the Senior Pro-Vice-Chancellor.**

- c) Wellcome Trust Communication plan  
Danny Kingsley reported on the communication plan to Wellcome Trust grant holders about a new rule introduced by the Wellcome Trust that Wellcome would pay APCs only for papers published by publishers on Wellcome's 'white list'.
- d) Request a copy  
Danny Kingsley explained that request a copy functionality in the repository allows for embargoed content in the repository to be requested directly of authors. Direct peer to peer sharing of embargoed content was copyright exempt. Many requests received for pre-publication manuscripts provided the rationale for HEFCE policy and for depositing research outputs into the repository within three months of the acceptance date.
- e) Symplectic Elements integration with the repository  
The full roll out of Symplectic Elements integration with the research repository was scheduled for the end of May 2017. As a result of the full integration all researchers coming to [www.openaccess.cam.ac.uk](http://www.openaccess.cam.ac.uk) to upload their manuscript would be re-directed to Symplectic Elements. The Project Board discussed the benefits of data integration and automated reporting offered by the fully connected systems.

#### **5. Research Data Management Project – OAPB-75.**

Peter Hedges introduced the Research Data Project Report (OAPB-75).

- a) Statistics on data downloads.  
Since October 2016 datasets from Apollo had been downloaded 8,090 times – this was more than datasets from any other UK repository. A 2015 dataset authored by Thomas, Coudray and Sutcliffe in the Computer Lab had been downloaded 1077 times; a dataset authored by Kendall, Grimes and Cipolla in the Department of Engineering had been downloaded 547 times.
- b) Data Champions programme  
Peter Hedges and Chris Young sent out letters to Heads of Departments and to Departmental Administrators to introduce them to their local Data Champions and to encourage better research data management across departments. Marta Teperek explained that the Data Champions are local research data management experts and most of them are postdocs, PhD students and PIs. Champions came up with creative ways of engaging their communities with data management: some sending emails about data management tips, and others delivering workshops and training.

The Project Board discussed the need for doctoral training in research data management (RDM) and how to best address the growing need. The Department of Chemistry has introduced compulsory training on RDM for all PhD students. The Graduate School of Life Sciences approached the Office of Scholarly Communication requesting provisions of compulsory RDM training for all their four hundred first year PhD students, but the costs of ~£300/workshop turned out to be prohibitive.

It was also reported that at Imperial College London all PhD students were asked to produce a data management plan as part of their first year report. This requirement prompted students to reflect on their data management. It was also noted that at the University of Cambridge, PhD students with Wellcome Trust funding were also required to submit data management plans as part of their first year report.

The Project Board agreed that training in research data management is core for graduate training and should be provided more systematically at the University. The

Project Board discussed the various options for providing the training, including incorporation of the training into the existing training structure. It was noted that given the number of researchers at the University of Cambridge who require RDM training, it might be challenging to offer it within the existing resources provision. The Chair asked Marta Teperek to prepare a proposal for research data management training for first year PhD students which should include: whole team training; or whole lectures with follow-up workshops; and more availability of online training. The proposal should include the advantages and disadvantages of each of the options.

Martin Bellamy noted that the UIS now offered a large data storage facility and that information about this resource could be added to the existing RDM training content.

**Action: Marta Teperek to prepare a proposal with various options for research data management training to be discussed at the next Project Board meeting.**

**Action: Martin Bellamy to share the details of the large data storage facility offering with Marta.**

#### **6. 2016 Annual Report of the Open Access Project Board – OAPB-76**

Danny Kingsley highlighted the key points from the Open Access Project Board 2016 Annual Report (OAPB-76).

**Action: Secretary to forward the report to RPC.**

#### **7. Future Direction of the Open Access Project Board – OAPB-77**

The Chair introduced OAPB-77 and explained that original aims of the Open Access Project Board had now largely been achieved. Given the Terms of Reference of the Project Board were now largely met, the proposal was that the number of meetings of the Open Access Project Board be reduced to one a year.

Project Board members discussed the proposal and noted that HEFCE compliance issues could now be reported to the REF Committee. Some members found Project Board meetings useful and important to maintain an oversight over Open Access matters at the University of Cambridge. It was therefore decided that the frequency of Project Board meetings be reduced to twice a year.

**Action: Secretary to update Terms of Reference accordingly and forward to RPC.**

#### **8. Items to be referred to Research Policy Committee**

The following papers will be forwarded to the Research Policy Committee:

- Revised Open Access Publications Policy Framework – for information
- OAPB Annual Report – for information
- Proposal for adjustment to OAPB's Terms of Reference
- 7 March 2017 Minutes – for information

#### **9. AOB**

**Action: Secretary to set the date of the second OAPB meeting in 2017.**