OPEN RESEARCH STEERING COMMITTEE

Minutes for Tuesday 29 March 2022, 15:00–16:30
MS Teams

Present: Niamh Tumelty (Chair), Holger Babinsky, Marta Costa, Stephen Eglen, Emma Gilby, Peter Hedges, Sara Hennessy, Amy Orben, David Owen, Siddharth Soni, Debbie Hansen (Secretary).

In attendance: Matthias Ammon.

Apologies: Jessica Gardner, Mandy Hill, Patricia Killiard, Ian Leslie, Steve Russell.

1 Declaration of interests

No interests were declared.

2 Minutes of previous meeting (13 December 2021) — ORSC-76

The minutes of the previous meeting were approved.

3 Matters arising: Report on actions from previous meetings — ORSC-77

Matters arising that were not complete or discussed during the remainder of the meeting:
1. *DORA Guidance and Metrics (item 4 of 13 December 2021 meeting)*: Current focus has been on the development of the rights retention pilot and awareness of this; this action can now be progressed.

4 UKRI Policy implementation — ORSC-78

This update was led by Niamh Tumelty. Niamh reiterated that the journal article part of the new UKRI open access policy will start for articles submitted from 1 April 2022; with the second part of the policy, covering long form publications, coming later. UKRI are providing the University with a block grant to pay for eligible open access costs (e.g. for eligible articles in fully open access journals and for payment towards read and publish agreements).

Siddharth Soni and Peter Hedges joined the meeting.

Niamh also summarised the work that has been done by the Rights Retention Working Group. The proposed approach has been developed. The Rights Retention Pilot will run from 1 April 2022 (subject to Legal Services responding by then) for one year. Researchers can opt-in to the Pilot and by doing so these researchers will be supported by the University to deposit their accepted manuscripts in Apollo with no embargo (even if the journal does have a defined embargo period) in compliance with increasing funder policies. At the same time the University recognises the need for journal sustainability; rights retention is a fallback for funder compliance where compliance cannot be achieved through other means (for example, the journal is not fully open access and the University does not have a read and publish agreement with the publisher; also if there is a read and publish agreement but the corresponding author is at another institution without access to a similar agreement, the rights retention route will be advised).

Peter explained that a case is being made for an institutional pot to support gold open access payments for our researchers who are not supported by grants and cannot access block grant funding. This would provide more equality of access to gold open access for journals that are not part of read and publish agreements.

A paper describing the rights retention approach has been seen by the Research Policy Committee (RPC) and the approach is currently being assessed by Legal Services. If no response has been received by 1 April researchers will still be encouraged and supported to include a rights retention statement in their manuscripts and submission letters in line with their funders' requirements.

Niamh also mentioned that a list of funders with an immediate open access requirement was currently being drawn up. This list will be used to identify and contact researchers in the University funded by any on the list to explain how they may be supported by opting in to the Pilot.

There are various questions arising about the new UKRI open access policy (for example whether 'data' papers are covered by the policy) and although UKRI are updating the FAQs on their website there are various points of detail still to have clarity on.

5 Report from the Working Group on Open Research in the Humanities
— ORSC-79

Emma Gilby summarised the content of this report and how this was arrived at. The working group aimed to give an overview that would characterise arts and humanities research as a whole. They set themselves the task of rewriting the League of European Research Universities (LERU) eight pillars of open research and these were simplified down to five pillars for open research in the arts and humanities. Under each pillar they explored opportunities and gave recommendations for support required. It was not an easy task to give recommendations partly due to the complex organisational structure of the University.

Matthias Ammon joined the meeting.

Niamh thanked Emma, Matthias and the rest of the working group for this extremely interesting piece of work and similar positive comments were made by other ORSC members. Some of the members not in arts and humanities disciplines did comment that, although the five pillars were written with arts and humanities in mind, a number of concerns raised were also being experienced in the STEM and social science areas and so are not unique to arts and humanities. This led to a discussion around sustainability of journals run by societies, whether the Open Library of Humanities (OLH) model had been considered, and incorporating digital humanities considerations along with the traditional humanities focus in this work. Emma noted that the plan was to adjust the document in accordance with comments made during this meeting. Niamh confirmed that this working group had formed for a fixed term and the work of the group had now finished. She also mentioned that the content of this working group report will feed into the draft discussion paper for the Open Research Programme. Advice was requested over where else this report from the working group should be discussed. In the first instance the paper will go to the Open Research Operational Group.

Matthias Ammon left the meeting.

Action: Emma Gilby update the document following comments and suggestions made in this ORSC meeting.

Action: Paper to be referred to the Open Research Operational Group.

6 ORSC Annual Report 2021
— ORSC-80

Niamh invited comments on the ORSC Annual Report 2021. She mentioned that if in future

a new structure of open research is defined then future annual reports would map onto the new structure. There was a question related to the section on open research training: what works best to trigger behaviour changes? This has not been investigated to date and Niamh will refer this question to the OSC Training Coordinator for consideration. There was also a brief discussion about the distribution of data champions and whether there were programme-level goals to target less well represented departments.

Action: Niamh to feedback comments to the appropriate teams.

7 Open Research Operational Group — ORSC-81

The first of the Future of Scholarly Communications workshops has now taken place. This first workshop looked at issues arising in the current landscape and steps Cambridge is taking in this space will be addressed next. Some points that came out of the workshop include: it is difficult to shape the future of scholarly communications without addressing existing culture and rewards and incentives; there is interest and support for diamond publishing (where the costs for open access are not met by the author or reader), with costs absorbed by the hosting institution; there is strong interest in Cambridge to lead on aspects of Scholarly Communication. ORSC members were invited to take part in the forthcoming workshops.

8 Items to be referred to the Research Policy Committee

The following papers will be forwarded to the RPC:
1. A copy of these minutes.
2. ORSC Annual Report 2021.

9 Any other business

Niamh raised the issue, on behalf of OROG, of how to reach researchers that are not part of Schools. Peter mentioned that all active University of Cambridge researchers should have a Symplectic Elements account.

Next Meeting: Monday, 27 June 2022, 15:00–16:30
MS Teams