



OPEN RESEARCH STEERING COMMITTEE

Minutes for Thursday 29 September 2022, 14:00–15:30 MS Teams

Present: Steve Russell (Chair), Alastair Flett, Jess Gardner, Sara Hennessy, Liz Simmonds (until end Item 4), Niamh Tumelty, Debbie Hansen (Secretary).

Apologies: Holger Babinsky, Marta Costa, Stephen Eglen, Emma Gilby, Peter Hedges, Mandy Hill, Ian Leslie, Amy Orben, David Owen, Siddharth Soni.

Steve Russell welcomed attendees to the meeting. A discussion about timing of future meetings led to the decision that all future meetings would be held within term dates.

1 Declaration of interests

No interests were declared.

2 Minutes of previous meeting (27 June 2022)

The minutes of the previous meeting were approved subject to a minor correction to the apologies.

3 Matters arising: Report on actions from previous meetings — ORSC-88

Matters arising that were not complete or discussed during the remainder of the meeting:

1. Future of Scholarly Communications Workshops (item 6 of 27 June 2022 meeting): Ongoing. Niamh will bring a document to a later meeting; the document will summarise the five main areas arising from the workshops and how it is intended they be taken forward.

4 Research Culture

Liz Simmonds provided an update to the group: the Research Culture Action Plan was discussed at ORSC in July 2021. There has been a lot of development in this space and Liz felt it was a good opportunity to update the group due to the combined interests between Research Culture and Open Research. One of the biggest changes is that a Research Culture Steering Committee is being established, with this new committee sitting between HR and Research Policy committees. A Chair is still being sought for this committee. Establishment of this committee is a positive development, giving the Research Culture Operational Group which will focus on the more practical aspects. A second big change is the award from Research England for the Action Research on Research Culture project, which is led by the University of Cambridge. This international project commenced at the start of September and the first 'team day' has now been held with the new team. Liz also mentioned the substantial Russell Group survey: an input from Cambridge has been provided and it will be interesting to see the results for the sector. Liz will provide the committee with a copy of the document supplied from Cambridge, for information.

Attendees expressed both how fantastic it was to see these developments and how valuable it is for the two groups (Research Culture and Open Research) to work together. Niamh Tumelty

- ORSC-89

--- ORSC-87

mentioned the forthcoming Open Research Community Manager post; the new post holder will be part of the Research Culture Operational Group.

A question was raised about where the monitoring and adherence to DORA principles should now sit. ORSC was involved in DORA start-up, but it is not appropriate for it to remain with ORSC beyond this into business-as-usual. Because of DORA's strong HR links (e.g. reward and recognition), would this now be better placed within the Research Culture groups? Liz Simmonds mentioned that this suggestion can be proposed to the Research Culture Steering Committee.

<u>Action:</u> Liz Simmonds to send the Russell group survey contribution from Cambridge to ORSC Secretary for distribution to the committee.

<u>Action:</u> Liz Simmonds to explore whether adherence and monitoring of DORA principles should come under the terms of reference of the Research Culture Steering Committee.

Liz Simmonds left the meeting.

5 DORA

Steve Russell stated that no tailored policies for research assessment had been received from schools by the requested date of 26th September. Steve intends, jointly with PVC-R, to write to school heads again. A report concerning the previously written and approved tailored policy for the Schools of Biological Sciences and Clinical Medicine showed that the principles of DORA are being followed within these schools.

Steve mentioned the European University Association <u>Agreement on Reforming Research</u> <u>Assessment</u> and asked generally whether the University of Cambridge would be in a position to be a signatory. It was agreed that it looks to be a good agreement to sign up to; the challenge would be moving from signing to implementation within the institution. It was noted that UKRI are taking the principles of DORA seriously and that funder mandates do help to move things where adoption or uptake is slow.

Action: Steve Russell to write a position paper for next ORSC meeting.

Sara Hennessy mentioned that last years' <u>Academic Career Pathways</u> (ACP) guidance to heads of institutions gave little mention of DORA or of open access and wondered whether work could be done with the ACP team to get an increase of visibility to help with this change of culture. Steve Russell will write to Sarah Botcherby from Human Resources to ask about the guidance that is being provided to applicants.

Action: Steve Russell to write to Sarah Botcherby about the guidance being provided to applicants.

6 Bibliometrics

Niamh Tumelty introduced this item. From feedback received by the DORA Working Group it was apparent that more concrete support and advice on bibliometrics was needed. Originally it was thought that a bibliometrics working group might be formed to work on this, but subsequently a decision was taken to task staff members from the Open Research Team to scope out what would be needed to deliver a bibliometrics service. Sam Moore will lead on this work, with input from Niamh Malin (data analysis) and Bea Gini (training).

7 Research data service

Niamh introduced the paper written by Sacha Jones, the Research Data Service Manager. She noted that, because of timing, this version of the report will also be going to RPC: any comments from ORSC will be incorporated in the verbal presentation to RPC.

Committee members were very complimentary about this excellent piece of work and the Chair passes on thanks to Sacha on behalf of the Committee. It is impressive what this team has achieved especially given the staff resourcing. Steve Russell suggested that the priorities should be firstly to consider what our researchers need, and then, secondly, to address the storage and infrastructure requirements based on these needs. Training, advocacy, and communication would come after this. A small discussion included the topics of research computing storage provided by UIS and the issue of managed access to data. The Committee agreed with the priority order put forward by Steve Russell.

8 Springer negotiations update service

Alastair Flett briefed the group on the status of the negotiations. A third offer has now been received from Springer and whilst this is moving in the right direction, there is still a way to go. There is some time pressure as the current contract ends in December with a two-month grace period. In the background Jisc is working on a variety of scenarios and will provide information packs which can be used for consultations. There was a short discussion about costs to authors additional to open access charges (page charges, colour figure charges).

9 Open access reports from Elements

Members of the committee commented on how useful the reporting tools will be. It was agreed that compliance with the REF open access policy now falls under core University business; the work around REF compliance has matured and has moved into business as usual. The responsibility of REF open access compliance should not lie with ORSC, but with the REF Project Board. ORSC still has an interest in high level compliance figures, but for an indication of where issues may be in terms of advocacy, and priorities for the open access and open research teams. A statement on this will be sent to RPC.

<u>Action:</u> Niamh Tumelty and Steve Russell to provide a statement to RPC regarding responsibilities for REF open accessing compliance monitoring.

10 *Open Research Conference

Niamh complimented the group that has been working on the programme for this open research event. She mentioned that there will be a challenge with encouraging researchers, not previously engaging with the open research agenda, to attend. This conference is a natural follow-on from the Future of Scholarly Communications workshops held earlier in the year. Sara Hennessy mentioned that she had not seen this advertised. Niamh stated that this event, being held in November, has been advertised in the Key Issues Bulletin and the <u>OSC website</u>, but she will ensure that members of this committee are notified of the details. Other ideas for advertising the event included the Data Champions group and the JCS CC (if not already contacted.

<u>Action:</u> Niamh Tumelty to pass on to Bea Gini ideas for further communications about the event.

3

– ORSC-92

— ORSC-93

- ORSC-90

– ORSC-91

11 *Open Research Operational Group

This was a starred item not discussed in the meeting.

12 Items to be referred to the Research Policy Committee

The following items will be forwarded to the RPC:

- 1. The approved minutes from the previous meeting.
- 2. In future, a package of the two papers from the Open Research in the Humanities and the Open Qualitative Research Working Group (once the latter paper has been finalised).
- 3. A statement to RPC regarding REF open accessing compliance monitoring.

13 Any Other Business

Steve Russell raised question of whether ORSC meetings should continue to be held remotely or whether they should be in person. Attendees expressed a mixed preference citing the benefits of meeting in person *and* the time saved with the on-line option. A mix was decided upon. Meetings where a substantial topic is planned to be discussed will be held wholly in person (not hybrid). Otherwise, the meetings will be on-line.

Next Meeting: Thursday, 26 January 2023, 14:00–15:30 MS Teams

Open Research Steering Committee Secretary:

Dr Debbie Hansen - <u>dh554@cam.ac.uk</u> - 01223 331872 Office of Scholarly Communication, University Library, Cambridge, CB3 9DR