

University of Cambridge
Open Access Project Board

Minutes – 23 October 2013

Meeting held at 9.00-10.00 on Weds 23rd October 2013
in the PVC Meeting Room, The Old Schools

Present: Professor Lynn Gladden (Chair), Professor Steve Young, Professor Howard Chase, Professor Martin Daunton, Professor Paul Luzio, Professor Andy Parker, Mr Graham Allen (in place of Mrs Stevens), Mrs Anne Jarvis, Mr John Norman and Dr Gill Rands (Secretary)

Apologies: Mrs Peta Stevens

Declaration of Interest: No new declarations were made.

1. Minutes of the previous meeting (16 May 2013) and matters arising – OAPB-14

1.1 The draft minutes of the meeting held on 16 May 2013 were approved (OAPB-14). Subsequent action by Elsevier had alleviated the specific concerns that had been raised about publisher behaviour. Other actions from the meeting were complete.

1.2 In response to a question that had been raised at the Colleges Committee, the Board confirmed that the University's OA support was fully available to College staff: they could apply to the University's RCUK fund for publication costs (provided that their work was sponsored by RCUK); and they could use the helpdesk service to make papers available via the green OA route. Concerns about the position of College-employed staff in relation to OA requirements in the post-2014 REF had been highlighted in the University's response to the current HEFCE consultation (see item 3 below).

2. Project report and analysis – OAPB-15

2.1 John Norman reported on the project's progress and financial status (OAPB-15) and highlighted that:

- a) RCUK would not claw back transition funds or block grant 'where money was being used in the spirit of the policy' and they would allow a reasonable roll-over of unspent block grant into Year 2 (from April 2014).
- b) Where the University had paid APCs, more than 40% of publishers were failing to deliver a satisfactory service in terms of the clarity of OA status and licence on the published articles. The OA team proposed to liaise with other universities and might threaten to stop authorising APCs to certain publishers unless performance improved.
- c) The number of APCs paid by the University each month had been running well below the target number that was needed if the block grant was to be fully spent. Moreover, a slight decline in the average APC paid meant that the target number had increased.
- d) A meeting with the Physics Department had revealed a wide variation in existing scholarly communication practices amongst that community. It had also confirmed that the RCUK policy was regarded as too complicated and that incorporating the emerging HEFCE policy could simplify the message that needed to be conveyed to researchers (see item 4 below).

- e) The OA team were collecting detailed data on OA queries, APC requests, payments, publication outcomes and publisher performance. Headline data were comparable with those at the University of Oxford and Imperial College.

2.2 **Action:** John Norman to present comparative data from peer universities at the next meeting.

2.3 Once the REF had been submitted, further work with the Symplectic dataset was needed to analyse publication patterns and likely impact of different funder policies. It was agreed that the data analyst post that had been part of Phase II of the transition programme should now go ahead.

2.4 **Action:** Graham Allen to take forward the data analyst post with John Norman.

3. HEFCE consultation: draft response – OAPB-16

3.1 HEFCE's consultation on OA in the post-2014 REF had been announced in July 2013, with a request for submissions by 30 October 2013. Schools had been invited to provide input to a University response and insight had also been gained from a HEFCE briefing meeting on 30 September 2013 attended by John Norman and Gill Rands.

3.2 The Board approved the draft University response (OAPB-16) with minor amendments and the addition of some further points from the School of the Humanities and Social Sciences. The submitted response would be posted on the University's OA website at <https://www.openaccess.cam.ac.uk/about>.

4. Implications of HEFCE OA policy – OAPB-17

4.1 John Norman introduced OAPB-17, which explored some implications of the HEFCE policy and presented proposals regarding the University's approach to communications and infrastructure.

4.2 HEFCE's *minimum* requirement was to make available the Author's Accepted Manuscript (AAM). The Board endorsed two key assumptions:

- a) Since an academic could not know which articles would be chosen for future REF submission, the safest course of action was to make all articles open access.
- b) The best time to encourage *deposit* of the AAM was at acceptance (noting that access to the article need not be until publication).

4.3 It was noted that collecting publication information ahead of publication (at acceptance) implied an evolving relationship between Symplectic and a 'Research Publication Catalogue'. After the REF submission, there would need to be a comprehensive review of the role of Symplectic and of the options for its future governance, support and development. There was also potential convergence with separate initiatives that were being led by MISD and UCS to create 'Researcher Pages'.

4.4 The Board agreed that:

- a) The HEFCE policy implied a requirement to attempt comprehensive collection of AAMs or (where Gold OA had been paid for) a record of the publisher version.
- b) A combined HEFCE/RCUK communication message should be piloted in anticipation of the HEFCE policy, but not scaled up until the final HEFCE policy was published early in 2014.

- c) Current initiatives on 'Researcher Pages' should be brought together to explore the possibility of a consolidated project that was responsive to the timescales of the OA requirements.

4.5 **Action:** John Norman to report to the Board by email on the outcome of a meeting with MISD and UCS about 'Researcher Pages' initiatives in November.

5. Author rights – OAPB-18

5.1 John Norman highlighted that the variety and obscurity of publisher policies was a major barrier to delivering OA publications. One means of cutting through this was to ensure that authors retained sufficient rights from the outset. OAPB-18 summarised the position of 'Amendment to Publication Agreement' addenda that authors could use to retain rights when signing publishers' copyright transfer agreements.

5.2 The Board agreed that:

- a) A University of Cambridge 'Amendment to Publication Agreement' addendum should be created on the template of the University of Edinburgh version.
- b) Such an addendum should be recommended and made available to Cambridge authors as part of the article acceptance and AAM deposit workflow. However, the decision as to whether or not to use such an addendum would lie entirely with the author.

6. Open research data – OAPB-19 and OAPB-20

6.1 In July 2013, a small group of representative researchers had been convened by Professor Michael Kelly (Chair), John Norman and Gill Rands for an initial discussion about possible University approaches to open research data. OAPB-19 presented some preliminary proposals arising from that discussion; a further paper (OAPB-20) highlighted the key recommendations in the context of questions about resource allocation.

The Board agreed that the University should adopt the 'work-in-progress' policy statement on open access to research data proposed in OAPB-19, namely:

Work-in-progress policy statement on open access to research data

- i. The University of Cambridge is committed to disseminating its research and scholarship as widely as possible. In keeping with that commitment, it supports the principle that the results of research that have been publicly funded should be freely accessible in the public domain and therefore it supports its staff in making their research available through open access.
- ii. In seeking to extend this principle to all forms of research data, the University is committed to taking institutional steps that are discipline-appropriate, proportionate, evidence-based, practical, cost-effective and sustainable.
- iii. The University affirms respect for disciplinary norms and for each individual's intellectual investment, recognising the tension between openness and other moral, ethical and legal principles.

This statement reiterated and extended the University's existing policy framework on open access, which was primarily concerned with research publications (see <https://www.openaccess.cam.ac.uk/about>).

It was agreed that in principle, the scope of data to be made OA should be identified in research grant applications and funded within the project. The institution would then hold a

record of what had been made available and where; and would provide a central repository service where this was needed.

However, the Research Councils' agenda on open research data contained some substantial risks for the University, particularly in relation to the potential costs. The Research Councils were not making funds available to address the additional work needed to make datasets useful to unknown potential users beyond the project that created the data, nor for the infrastructure needed to make sure it was useful and safe to release the data and to keep it available in a usable format for periods of 10 years and more. In some cases, the costs of curating the data could outweigh all other costs of the research. Oxford and UCL had done some high-level modelling of costs and it was reasonable to assume that a mature, effective research data service might easily absorb £2m per annum across the institution, and possibly considerably more.

The Board agreed that it was essential to pursue a dialogue with RCUK and the individual Research Councils (particularly EPSRC) about these matters. A series of case studies on research data costs could provide helpful evidence to challenge unreasonable expectations and to consider the implications for the University's research overhead costs.

The Board endorsed the proposals in OAPB-19 to scope a Research Data Open Access Register and to set up a working group to investigate costs. It was hoped that the latter could report at the next Board meeting, which would be held before the end of the year if possible.

Action: Lynn Gladden to raise open data issues at the University's Framework Meeting with EPSRC in December 2013.

Action: John Norman and Gill Rands to convene a costs working group and develop some case studies for consideration at the next meeting.

7. AOB

None.