University of Cambridge
Open Access Project Board

Minutes – 23 July 2015

Meeting held at 15.30-17.00 on Thursday 23rd July 2015
in the Syndicate Room, The Old Schools

<u>Present</u>

Professor Lynn Gladden, Pro-Vice-Chancellor for Research	Chair
Professor Steve Young, Pro-Vice-Chancellor for Planning & Resources	
Professor Richard Prager, School of Technology	
Professor John Danesh, School of Clinical Medicine	
Professor Abby Fowden, School of Biological Sciences	
Dr Nicholas White, School of Arts and Humanities	
Dr Alan Blackwell, School of Technology (User Needs Committee representative)	
Mrs Anne Jarvis, University Library	
Dr Peter Hedges, University Research Office	
Dr Danny Kingsley, Office of Scholarly Communications, University Library	
Dr Martin Bellamy, University Information Services	
Dr Ralph Ecclestone, Research Strategy Office (REF Manager)	
Dr Gill Rands, Research Strategy Office	Secretary
Dr Marta Teperek, Research Operations/University Library (Research Data Facilitator)	Observer

<u>Apologies</u>
Professor Graham Virgo, Pro-Vice-Chancellor for Education
Professor Peter Mandler, School of the Humanities and Social Sciences
Professor Rob Kennicutt, School of Physical Sciences

<u>Declarations of Interest:</u> No new declarations were made.

The Chairman welcomed Alan Blackwell as a member of the Project Board on the nomination of the User Needs Committee.

1. Minutes of previous meeting and matters arising – OAPB-42

1.1 The draft minutes of the meeting held on 31 March 2015 were approved (OAPB-42). Actions from that meeting were complete or included below at items 2 and 3.

1.2 On 23 April 2015, the Research Policy Committee had approved the matters referred to it by the Project Board, namely:
- The recommendation that the University should initiate an institutional implementation of ORCIDs in association with the Symplectic system.
- The Research Data Management Policy Framework (now available at http://www.data.cam.ac.uk/university-policy).

1.3 An update on the ORCID roll-out had been circulated to Project Board members on 15 June 2015.

2. Open Access Project – OAPB-43

2.1 Danny Kingsley introduced a report on the Open Access Project (OAPB-43) and highlighted the following areas.

ORCID

2.2 The ORCID pilot in Physics had proved instructive, and discussions were now being held with a number of Departments/Faculties about the next phase of the roll-out. Graduate students would be included in the roll-out and would have profiles in Symplectic. ORCID was required for Wellcome Trust grant applications from 1 August 2015, and was under consideration by HEFCE as a mandatory identifier for researchers in the next REF.

2.3 **Action:** Danny Kingsley and Nick White to discuss how best to engage Arts and Humanities colleagues in the Symplectic and ORCID developments.

RCUK block grant

2.4 Expenditure on RCUK open access publications was currently well within the RCUK block grant and it was therefore unlikely that a contingency plan would be needed this year. However, the Project Board agreed that if funds did run low, action should be taken when 85% of the year's spend had been reached. At this point, the University would cease paying APCs for hybrid journals and pay only for fully open access journals.

2.5 Further work was attempting to identify all RCUK-funded publications, so that the proportion being submitted through the OA service could be determined; and to develop mechanisms for contacting those authors whose publications were not known to be compliant with their funder's policy.

HEFCE compliance

2.6 The rate of compliance with HEFCE's requirement for deposition of accepted manuscripts had recently plateaued at less than 30% of the expected total, despite extensive communication efforts. Although peer institutions reported similar levels of compliance, this was a matter of concern since the HEFCE requirement for the next REF was due to come into force from 1 April 2016.

2.7 **Action:** Lynn Gladden and Ralph Ecclestone to raise the matter of OA compliance requirements at the REF Policy Board, in the context of REF communications.

2.8 **Action:** Danny Kingsley to prepare a detailed report on each School for consideration by the relevant School committee. Ideally this would include an analysis of compliance at the level of Departments/Faculties and individuals as well as by articles, since discipline norms and individual behaviour (whether an author routinely deposited their accepted manuscripts or not) were likely to be key.

2.9 It was agreed that a significant culture change was still needed to ensure that all researchers would meet the HEFCE REF requirements and, where RCUK-funded, would avoid potential sanctions. It was suggested that OA compliance should become a criterion for academic promotion and professorial pay review decisions. Use of an automated report from Symplectic might helpfully simplify the process for applicants and provide an incentive for individuals to update their Symplectic profile.

2.10 **Action:** Danny Kingsley to provide a one-page briefing, which Lynn Gladden would discuss with the Director of Human Resources in the first instance.

HEFCE policy

2.11 On 22 July 2015 it had been reported that HEFCE intended temporarily to relax its deposition rules. It was anticipated that for the period April 2016 to April 2017, papers would be eligible for the next REF if deposited within three months of the date of publication (rather

than acceptance). It was noted that this relaxation would enable Symplectic to be used to identify published articles for which no accepted manuscript had been received, and authors could then be contacted.

Note added after meeting: HEFCE had written to HEI Heads on 24 July 2015 with details of their policy adjustments and qualifications. The letter would be circulated with the minutes.

3. Open Data Project – OAPB-44 and OAPB-45

3.1 Peter Hedges introduced OAPB-44, which presented a draft business case for a University research data management and storage facility. The plan identified the need for a start-up funding provision (for personnel, systems, licenses etc.) totalling £515k over three years from October 2015. After this, the facility would be expected to be financially self-sustaining through direct cost recovery from grants. The proposal included the option to purchase archival storage from Arkivum; it was agreed that there needed to be further discussion with UIS about research data storage.

3.2 **Action:** Danny Kingsley and Martin Bellamy to investigate further options in relation to the University's new strategy for archival storage capacity.

3.3 The Project Board felt that the University should take a broadly discipline-based approach to the open research data agenda and, in the current circumstances, a minimal approach to compliance. In many cases, funders' stated expectations were neither clear nor realistic, making no distinction between 'all data', 'useable data' and 'useful data' and assuming uncertain benefits. Moreover, the discrepancies between the positions of the individual Research Councils made an institutional response extremely difficult. While it was acknowledged that the present proposal would ensure compliance with EPSRC's policy, the Project Board felt that further work was needed to articulate how the service would complement the significant work that researchers would need to undertake to comply with EPSRC's requirement in such a way as to enable the data to be used by other researchers.

3.4 After considerable discussion, the Project Board did not endorse the business case as presented in OAPB-45 and wished to see further dialogue with the Schools and Research Councils as the next step. In particular, it was felt that the Research Councils should be challenged to share and agree best practice.

3.5 **Action:** Peter Hedges and Danny Kingsley to work with the Schools to raise open data concerns in forthcoming meetings with the individual Research Councils, and bring a further paper to the next Project Board meeting.

3.6 The Project Board received for information a report on the Open Data Project (OAPB-45) and noted that there had been excellent progress since January in developing the University's support for researchers in managing and sharing their research data.

4. Draft UK Concordat on Open Research Data– OAPB-46

4.1 Peter Hedges reported that the Russell Group had been taking the lead in developing a UK Concordat on Open Research Data, with input from RCUK, HEFCE, charities, publishers, BIS and others. The aim was to take a proactive approach to establishing sound principles for open research data across the sector. A draft of this document, prefaced by comments from the University's Open Data Project Working Group, had been circulated as OAPB-46.

4.2 It was now known that there would be a public consultation on a newer version of the draft Concordat between mid-August and the end of September 2015. It was therefore agreed that Project Board members would be asked to provide comments in due course on the formal consultation document, rather than on the circulated draft.

4.3 **Action:** Secretary to invite members to contribute to the University's response to the public consultation on the Open Research Data Concordat in August/September.

5. Items to be referred to Research Policy Committee

5.1 The Chairman would highlight key points from the Project Board meeting at the Research Policy Committee on 8 October 2015.

6. AOB

6.1 No other business was raised.

Date of next meeting: Weds 11 November at 3.30-5.00pm in the Syndicate Room.