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Open Research OPERATIONAL GROUP

**Minutes for Wednesday 16th June 2021, 10:30 – 12:00**

**Via Teams**

**Present**: Niamh Tumelty (Chair), Laura Boxall (Secretary), Augustina Martinez-Garcia (AM), Claire Sewell (CS), Beatrice Gini (BG), Matthew Day (MD), Steve Russell (SR), Liz Simmonds (LSi), Samuel Moore (SM), Sacha Jones (SJ), Lucinda Spokes (LSp), Owen Robertson (OR), Patricia Killiard (PK), Rhys Morgan (RM).

**Apologies**: None

### 1 Welcome to new members

Welcome to Laura Boxall, Dr Samuel Moore and Dr Matthias Ammon.

Introductions from all attendees

### 2 Minutes of previous meeting (10 March 2021) — OROG-07

The minutes of the previous meeting were approved as accurate.

### 3 Action log and matters arising - OROG 08

### NT confirmed the action log is being monitored and actions are progressing. The updated action log will be regularly included in the OROG papers.

### 4 Towards Cambridge Reproducible Research Network — OROG-09

Led by RM.

A Reproducible Research Working Group (RRWG) is looking at how to establish a network and expand support across the University.

Reproducibility is currently very scattered across the University. There are various networks but there is currently no University wide structure for ensuring consistency. One of the main aims of the RRWG is to establish this structure. The paper sets out initial activities and longer-term goals.

One of the longer-term recommendations is for the University to join the reproducibility network as a member. Although this would incur a cost, there are benefits across the University if membership were secured. Another longer-term proposal is to work with HR to ensure reproducibility is part of hiring process and there is also a possibility of working with the Alan Turing Foundation.

RM invited questions and feedback from the group.

The group was fully supportive of the need to engage with and communicate the remit of the RRWG and a discussion followed as to how best to ensure there is a high level of buy-in across the University to ensure a structured, cohesive approach. There was interest in the training element and enthusiasm for a discipline centred approach to encourage engagement and ensure specific needs of the different Schools are heard and considered. The Data Champion Network could be drawn on for support. Reproducibility training came out as a priority from every break-out group at the recent reproducibility event so there is a strong desire for reproducibility training across the board.

Discussion also touched on the need to work on how the open research and reproducibility websites interlink, the availability of tools to assist with reproducible research, the reputational advantage of being part of the UKRN, that other universities (e.g. Oxford) are investing in support for reproducibility and that Cambridge University should not be lagging behind on this. Cambridge University Press are working with their Humanities researchers to explore reproducibility/transparency approaches which will hopefully develop over the coming months. The Reproducibility Group will be invited to contribute a session as part of the Open Research event intended for November 2021.

Additional comments as part of the online discussion:

* Navigating the relationship between these spaces can be hard – a conceptual graphic might help. Related to retraction watch too perhaps?
* Bioinformatics training facility and Social Sciences Research Methods Centre may also be good people to speak to about training in this area. At least to have consistent messages across the board.
* COPE (Committee on Publication Ethics) might have some useful materials to refer to as well.

**Action: OROG supportive of commitment to reproducibility and recognised the importance of investing in this area. Refer to ORSC for consideration.**

### 5 Open Research Event – OROG -10

Led by BG.

BG set out the purpose of the event as an opportunity to promote and raise awareness of OR. There is enthusiasm among the wider University to reach a wide audience and engage a variety of voices. The group was asked to respond to the questions set out in the paper:

**Q**: Does the group have any suggestions to engage a broad spectrum of researchers?

Securing a ‘statement of support’ from the Pro-Vice Chancellor for Research and other senior leaders would be hugely beneficial to help emphasise high level support of the OR programme. It would also be important to engage with Schools on a Council level to following a ‘top down’ approach for communication for the event. Exploring as many channels as possible will help ensure engagement is at a suitably high level.

It was noted that we have a captive audience in the PG students and DTPs/CDTs can be used to promote the event. However, there needs to be consideration given to how best to reach all areas of the University and in particular, PIs who will be instrumental in reiterating the OR message to their students which will help reinforce the University’s OR policy.

Moving forward, Open Research training could be added to regular PI training or added as part of an induction programme. Reiterating the OR message on a regular basis it would help ensure OR is of key importance to PIs. There was a suggestion that Jessie Monk in the University PPD office could be a contact for this query.

There was further discussion that the Elsevier negotiations will encourage people to engage with the event as it will be more obvious that developments on this will impact their research.

Members of the group were happy to use their communication channels to promote the event and there was support for adding the details into training calendars where possible.

**Q**: Are there any particular questions we might hope to answer as we listen to researchers during this event? Are there any key themes?

There is a need to embed the Open Research Policy/mission statement into people’s minds across the board and this would include a need to remind people of our statutory, reputational and operational obligations in this area. One avenue to think about is to make it clear that OR and contributions to OR will be considered as part of the research assessment criteria. UKRI (and funding implications) have their own position on this which is to be confirmed soon and this should then also be highlighted across all affected groups.

There was a suggestion that the Cambridge University position and commitment to Open Research could be offered as the initial keynote session for the event to help ‘set the stage’ and reiterate the message ‘Why should we care about Open Research?’

With the UKRI soon to announce their OR expectations, it may be beneficial for them to run a session at the event to ensure their position is clear and to help PhD students, Postdocs and PIs understand the implications if the requirements are not met. There was a suggestion that Duncan Willingham might be an appropriate contact for this. Other possible contacts or contributors suggested at the meeting included Mandy Hill (CUP), Ottoline Leyser (UKRI), Robert Jan-Smit (Envoy on open access to EC), Peter Mandler and Sue Gathercole.

Other external parties could also be invited, including CRUK and any other appropriate University partners.

**Q**: Is the group in agreement with making this primarily an internal event?

BG and NT explained that the current preference is to make this an internal event so that we can focus on engaging researchers within the University in issues around open research, going beyond the usual audience for these events. The current thinking is that the sessions would be bookable via Raven log in and Keynote lectures could be recorded to then shared at a later date.

There was overall support from the group to make the event internal, with recordings being made available after the sessions. Recordings could also be added to the OSC/OR website and sent to departments to help promote our Open Research standpoint and further communicate this as an ongoing commitment.

There was a query as to whether there had been any analysis of particular groups that the event is aiming to hit and although this has not yet been carried out, making the sessions bookable via Raven could provide useful data of attendees for use in the future.

**Q:** What format should the sessions take?

There were no objections to the proposal of having a variety of formats including interactive workshops, talks and panel discussions, with each session lasting for between 60 – 120 minutes.

**Q:** Do any members of this group have an interest in proposing a session?

BG and LB are aiming to send a call for proposals in the next week and this communication will include information setting out the expectations on session leaders regarding the various tasks involved with session planning (with support from BG/LB).

There was a high level of interest and engagement from the group, with various members offering to lead a session, share the programme and reiterate the importance of the event within their communication channels. It was noted that the timeline should be driven by availability of senior leadership team who would be key in helping to promote the OR message across the wider University.

Additional comments as part of the online discussion:

* (LSi) proposed a session on importance of OR to research culture
* (LSp) proposed a citizen research/public engagement session

**Action: BG and LB to send Call for Proposals out by Tuesday 22nd June. BG and LB to approach those named above as possible contacts and those who stated an interest in leading a specific session.**

### 6 \*Elsevier Negotiations – OROG-11

For information

### 7 \*Working Group on Open Research in the Humanities – OROG-12

For information

### 8 \*Draft Minutes of the ORSC meeting, 7th May 2021 – OROG-13

For information

### 9 \*Open Research Work Plan – OROG- 14

For information

### 10 Items to be referred to the Open Research Steering Committee (July 2021)

The following papers will be forwarded to the ORSC:

1. Reproducibility paper- OROG 09 (to be referred to ask for committee support before then being fed up to RPC

Note: Open Research event details to be sent to September ORSC meeting when more details are finalised.

### 11 Next meeting of the Open Research Operational Group

There is a diary slot for 15th September as the next meeting but would the group be open to a workshop style meeting to identify specific challenges/opportunities/strands for consideration. This could be in person or online. NT invited comments and feedback to be e-mailed to her directly.

Should a workshop style meeting be preferable to the group, there was a suggestion that Eddington would be an appropriate space.

**Action: OROG members to e-mail NT with any feedback on a workshop style meeting.**

**12 Any Other Business**

There was a final discussion around open access monographs, including the COPIM project. There is currently ongoing work taking place on business models for open research and the requirements should be considered at the beginning of the research process. Software requirements need to be considered and there is currently work taking place on small scale publishing operations. Open monograph is also well within the remit of the Humanities Working.

NT noted that Meg Westbury, research lead for the Humanities & Social Sciences Libraries, is keen to get a social sciences working group up and running and will send details once confirmed.

*Open Research Operational Group Secretary: Laura Boxall*

Laura Boxall [ljb90@cam.ac.uk](mailto:ljb90@cam.ac.uk)

Office of Scholarly Communication, University Library, Cambridge, CB3 9DR