

University of Cambridge  
**Open Access Project Board**

**Minutes – 11 November 2015**

---

Meeting held at 15.00-16.30 on Wednesday 11<sup>th</sup> November 2015  
in the Syndicate Room, The Old Schools

Present

Professor Lynn Gladden, Pro-Vice-Chancellor for Research	Chair
Professor Duncan Maskell, Senior Pro-Vice-Chancellor	
Professor Richard Prager, School of Technology	
Professor Abby Fowden, School of Biological Sciences	
Professor Peter Mandler, School of the Humanities and Social Sciences	
Professor Rob Kennicutt, School of Physical Sciences	
Professor 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 Joanna Jasiewicz, Research Strategy Office (Research Analyst)	Observer
Dr Marta Teperek, Research Operations/University Library (Research Data Facilitator)	Observer

Apologies

Professor Graham Virgo, Pro-Vice-Chancellor for Education  
Professor John Danesh, School of Clinical Medicine  
Dr Nicholas White, School of Arts and Humanities

Declarations of Interest: No new declarations were made.

---

The Chairman welcomed Duncan Maskell, Senior Pro-Vice-Chancellor, as a member of the Project Board.

**1. Minutes of previous meeting and matters arising – OAPB-47**

1.1 The draft minutes of the meeting held on 23 July 2015 were approved (OAPB-47). Actions from that meeting were complete apart from action 2.8. Danny Kingsley reported that it had not been possible, for technical reasons, to prepare the detailed open access compliance reports indicated at action 2.8 (at the level of individual Principal Investigators). However, Danny would now send updated reports on open access compliance levels by School and Faculty/Department to Project Board members and School Secretaries.

1.2 In relation to action 4.3 at the June meeting, Danny Kingsley thanked Project Board members who had contributed their comments about the UK Concordat on Open Research Data. Cambridge had led a strong joint response on the Concordat (with the Universities of Oxford, Nottingham, Bristol and Manchester) and this had been submitted to RCUK on 28 September 2015.

**2. Open Data Project and Research Data Management – OAPB-48**

2.1 Danny Kingsley introduced a report on the Open Data Project (OAPB-48) and highlighted the following areas.

---

## Funders' requirements for sharing research data

2.2 Most of the University's funders now required research data underpinning publications to be shared, and encouraged researchers to budget for the costs of data management and sharing in grant applications. Many funders had also introduced spot checks and sanctions for non-compliance.

## Services to support research data management and sharing at Cambridge

2.3 A questionnaire had been conducted amongst the academic community to identify the research data management services most needed at the University, and the Open Data Team had developed services in accordance with the identified needs. In response to a growing number of requests for support in the preparation of data management plans, a dedicated data management plan service was now being launched. Heads of School agreed that requests for this support should be submitted to the Open Data Team at least 14 days in advance of the relevant grant submission deadline.

## Business case for a central University Research Data Management Facility

2.4 Danny Kingsley and Peter Hedges presented the case for an ongoing University Research Data Management Facility (slides to be circulated with the minutes). The Project Board was asked to consider whether research data management services should continue to be provided centrally, and if so, what would be the appropriate funding model.

2.5 The Project Board agreed that:

- a) The services that had been developed (online information, support for data management plans, training, institutional repository, policy negotiations and advocacy activities) should continue to be provided as an effective and responsive small-scale central Facility. This would ensure that the University continued to meet its compliance obligations, and it would also help to promote a culture of research data management and open data across the University.
- b) The cost of such a Facility should be recovered as a direct cost on grant applications, and all new grant applications made in X5 after March 2016 must include this cost in addition to any research-specific data management costs. Further dialogue with funders was needed to clarify the appropriate budget lines, and joint discussions with Russell Group colleagues would be helpful.
- c) Transition funding of around £150k per annum should be provided for 12-18 months from January 2016 to support the Facility until it became sustainable from funds recovered from awarded grants. The Senior Pro-Vice Chancellor agreed that it would be appropriate to submit an application to the Resource Management Committee for a non-recurrent grant for the funds required for the transitional period. It was further agreed that the grant application should be prepared by the University Librarian, in consultation with the Head of the Research Office as required.
- d) The funding model should be reviewed after one year.

2.6 **Action:** Peter Hedges to propose at the next Project Board meeting (a) a model for cost recovery directly from grant applications in a manner proportionate to the data management costs incurred by each project, and (b) a mechanism to ensure that Facility charges were included as an obligatory cost for sign-off in every new grant application.

2.7 **Action:** Peter Hedges and Danny Kingsley to confirm with funders that the proposed model for the recovery of Facility costs would be eligible in grant applications; and to discuss cost recovery with Russell Group colleagues.

### 3. Open Access Project – OAPB-49

3.1 Danny Kingsley introduced a report on the Open Access Project (OAPB-49) and highlighted the following areas.

#### Systems updates

3.2 The University Library was in the process of recruiting for a new post of Repository Integration Manager (to start in January 2016) to get feedback from stakeholders and integrate the University's research repository with Symplectic Elements.

3.3 The institutional research repository 'Apollo' (formerly known as DSpace@Cambridge) was to be upgraded by Easter 2016. The updated version would enable the 'Request a copy button' functionality, which would allow embargoed items to be requested and shared.

#### Compliance with funders' Open Access policies

3.4 The RCUK compliance report had been submitted on 6 November 2015 and the deadline for the Charity Open Access Fund (COAF) report had been extended. Preparing reports on Open Access policy compliance was resource-intensive and this year had required the equivalent of two months of a full-time employee, because of the amount of manual work involved in extracting the detailed information required by funders.

3.5 Currently it was estimated that around 60% of all of the University's publications were compliant with the HEFCE policy on Open Access:

- 32% were being made open access by submitting to [www.openaccess.cam.ac.uk](http://www.openaccess.cam.ac.uk);
- 6.5% were made open access by deposition on arXiv;
- 6% were made open access as a result of the Springer Compact agreement;
- 7% of publications not funded by RCUK/COAF were reported to be accessible open access at Web of Science;
- 8% of publications acknowledging RCUK/COAF funding were made available by payments to publishers for the gold open access option, but the payment used was from resources other than the University's RCUK/COAF block grants.

3.6 The Open Access Team were constantly developing new approaches to raise the level of HEFCE compliance. For example, the Team were proactively checking to ensure that all articles published in high impact factor journals were open access. They had also identified all RCUK-funded Principal Investigators at the University and were investigating the reasons why some of these did not publish their work open access.

#### ORCID rollout

3.7 The ORCID rollout had been successfully piloted in four departments/institutes. The Project Board agreed that the School Secretaries should now be asked to disseminate information about ORCIDs to all departments and institutes across the University.

#### Communication issues

3.8 Various communication issues had been uncovered during discussions with academics. Several University offices (including the University Library, the Research Office and the University Information Services) were involved in communicating with academics about aspects of the research lifecycle, but the messages received by the community were often felt to be incoherent. Additionally, there was no overarching strategy for the timing of these messages, or the channels to be used to distribute them. It had been proposed in OAPB-49 that a non-recurrent grant of £50k would enable a one-year project to create and implement

a co-ordinated communications plan for University services across the research lifecycle, focusing initially on the HEFCE/REF message in light of the April 2016 deadline.

3.9 The Project Board endorsed the need for such a project but felt that the necessary resource should be made available from existing staff in the relevant offices, working with the Office of External Affairs and Communications.

#### **4. Open Access Policy Issues – OAPB-50**

4.1 Anne Jarvis introduced two Open Access policy issues (OAPB-50) as follows.

##### UK Scholarly Communications Licence

4.2 Led by Imperial College, a number of UK universities were promoting the idea of a UK Scholarly Communications Licence. This was also being discussed by LERU. In its current formulation, such a licence would not be compatible with Cambridge's Intellectual Property Rights policy. Project Board members highlighted specific concerns about the text of the draft Licence and Danny Kingsley agreed to take this feedback to the LERU Chief Information Officers' meeting that she would be attending on 13 November 2015.

4.3 **Action:** Danny Kingsley to provide a brief report from the discussion at LERU about the UK Scholarly Communications Licence.

##### University's Open Access Policy Framework

4.4 The University's Open Access Policy Framework had been approved in January 2013. The Project Board agreed that it would be timely to review the Framework statement, and in particular the reference to the CC-BY licence, at the next meeting.

4.5 **Action:** Secretary to invite members to comment on the University's Open Access Policy Framework and collate the feedback for discussion at the next meeting.

#### **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 26 November 2015.

#### **6. AOB**

6.1 Noting that many academics sit on publishers' committees, Alan Blackwell suggested that the Project Board should consider how best to bring pressure to bear on publishers about their open access policies.

6.2 **Action:** Alan Blackwell to prepare a paper about engagement with publishers, for discussion at the next Project Board meeting.

6.3 Duncan Maskell suggested that the Project Board might benefit from drawing on the expertise of Cambridge University Press (CUP). In the light of the forthcoming discussion about publisher engagement, it was agreed that a CUP representative should be invited to attend the next meeting of the Project Board.

6.4 **Action:** Secretary to invite a CUP representative to attend the next meeting.

6.5. Peter Hedges announced that Joanna Jasiewicz and Marta Teperek would take over as joint Secretaries for the Project Board from the next meeting. The date of the next meeting would be confirmed by circulation.