

Open Research Steering Committee

Minutes for Wednesday 23 October 2019, 11:00–12:30
Council Room, The Old Schools

Present: Chris Abell (Chair), Mark Carrigan, Marta Costa, John Dennis, Jessica Gardner, Emma Gilby, Peter Hedges, Sara Hennessy, Mandy Hill, Steve Russell, Niamh Tumelty, André Sartori (Secretary).

In attendance: Patricia Killiard, Agustina Martínez-García, Arthur Smith.

Apologies: Vasily Belokurov, Lauren Cadwallader, Ian Leslie, David Owen, Owen Roberson.

1 Minutes of previous meeting (3 July 2019) — ORSC-16

The minutes of the previous meeting were approved.

2 Matters arising: Report on actions from previous meetings

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

- a) *Data about article processing charge payments across the University (item 7 of 2 May 2019 meeting):* Data collection and analysis in progress. Ten colleges have responded to request for APC data so far.
- b) *ORTTG to coordinate training on Open Research and Research Integrity (item 9 of 3 July 2019 meeting):* In progress. Focus group workshops to be carried out with PhD students and postdocs in Oct/Nov. Following this a strategy will be drafted.

3 Revised Research Data Management Policy Framework (RDMPF) — ORSC-17

Jessica Gardner summarised the revisions made to the RDMPF since the draft document was discussed at the last meeting of the Committee. The revised draft was circulated to Committee members in early September to allow ample time for scrutiny. Revision of the draft presented during the last meeting was not extensive. The definition of research staff and students on paragraph 4 and the text of paragraph 18 were reworked.

ORSC members were invited to comment. It was noted that it would be desirable to change the wording of paragraph 29 to accommodate research projects that are not externally funded.

Discussion then focused on the RDM recommendations arising from the recent Wellcome Trust Audit. It was noted that (1) fulfilling Wellcome's recommendations, particularly recommendation 4 (monitoring adherence to data management plans [DMPs]), would be costly for the University. Even if Wellcome were to provide additional funding for the projects they support, such projects represent only a small proportion of research carried out

in Cambridge; (2) an institutional policy setting baseline requirements for DMPs in all departments, coupled with implementation and monitoring at the departmental level, might be a feasible path to fulfilling recommendation 4; (3) the University's network of Data Champions will be valuable to scope the requirements of a policy on the management of manual records (recommendation 3).

Action: Paragraph 29 of the RDMPF to be revised before the Framework is presented to RPC.

Action: Wellcome recommendations will be discussed further during the next meeting of the Committee.

4 DORA Working Group update — ORSC-18

Steve Russell summarised the remit and draft work plan of the DORA Working Group. Committee members were invited to comment. It was noted that (1) the word “metrics” is not a suitable term to refer to quantitative tools intended to assist research assessment; (2) if publishers did not limit the number of citations in papers, researchers would be more likely to cite original research rather than review articles; (3) UKRI has issued guidance stating that journal Impact Factors should not be taken into consideration when assessing the quality of an output during REF2021; (4) very few institutions in the UK have taken steps that go beyond the signature of DORA; (5) one of the main challenges for the DORA Working Group will be to develop an inclusive Framework.

The Chair requested that consideration of paper ORSC-19 be postponed to the end of the meeting. Thus, “Plan S Update” was discussed next.

5 Plan S update — ORSC-20

Patricia Killiard summarised the University Libraries' ongoing work to coordinate the management of subscription and Open Access budgets. Until recently these funds have been managed separately but, with publishers moving toward “Read and Publish” agreements to meet the requirements of Plan S funders, a much closer integration of these budgets is now required. The risks to publishers in moving from two funding streams to a single publishing agreement are significant. Read and Publish agreements may be prohibitively expensive for research intensive institutions. Wiley is the largest publisher in the horizon for renewal negotiations; talks with Elsevier will also start relatively shortly. Testing the appetite of the Cambridge research community for a hard stance in negotiations via a short questionnaire is one of the strategies being considered. Discussions with CUP to better understand the point of view of publishers have been really useful.

ORSC members were invited to comment. Mandy Hill tabled slides providing more details of the challenges faced by CUP in its transition to Open Access publishing. There are fewer libraries that will pay to publish than pay to read content, but research intensive universities do not have funds to close the gap. CUP are projecting a 15% decline in revenue in the next

years, but they are still going ahead with the transition to Open Access, a decision that they recognise is easier for them to take than for a commercial publisher. CUP are also committed to ensuring that Open Access does not constitute a barrier to authors in the global south. CUP's proposal for the University of Cambridge is that the University Library would pay £220,000 compared to the current spend of £120,000 to publish all Cambridge content Open Access (this would cost £440,000 if effected via the payment of individual APCs).

It was noted that (1) there is still a large gap between current spend and the pricing of this proposed deal with CUP; (2) current spend with CUP includes funds that are not controlled by the Library, such as journal subscriptions by Colleges, and APCs paid from UKRI funds that might not be renewed; (3) if agreements with big commercial publishers were not renewed, some of those funds could be used to finalise deals with CUP and other not-for-profit publishers; (4) the University should not lose sight of the impact of the outcome of negotiations on its educational activities.

6 Open Research Infrastructure Map — ORSC-21

Agustina Martinez-Garcia highlighted the key points of this paper:

- a) In the second half of 2018, UIS compiled a list of strategic IT needs and service requests of Schools in order to identify priorities.
- b) The Open Research Infrastructure Group (ORIG) looked at the existing Open Research technical landscape and concluded that the current Cambridge provision of tools in this area is well advanced.
- c) However, there are still gaps in provision. Enhancing existing RDM services is in the Library's Open Research roadmap and will include collaborative work with UIS.
- d) CUP and CUL are currently looking into options for future collaboration within the space of research systems and services.
- e) CUL is developing an Open Research roadmap that would then feed back into the Research portfolio owned by the PVC-R.

To expedite the proceedings, members of the Committee were asked to advise on the priorities outlined in the paper and to send any other comments and feedback by e-mail to Agustina Martinez-Garcia.

The Chair asked Peter Hedges to chair the remainder of the meeting and apologised for having to leave.

7 REF Open Access compliance update — ORSC-19

Peter Hedges summarised the results of the mock REF exercise carried out earlier this year. The exercise was valuable in highlighting the challenges faced by the different departments and Units of Assessment (UoAs). In some cases, it is possible to identify exceptions or routes to compliance for outputs that were not deposited in Apollo within the required time frame, but this is a laborious and convoluted process. Departments in the same

UoA have achieved rather different compliance rates, so efforts carried out at the departmental level are clearly impactful.

ORSC members were invited to comment. It was noted that (1) the process of depositing papers in Apollo is already as easy and straightforward as possible; (2) Biorxiv explicitly states that they do not accept post prints (author's accepted manuscripts) so, in the absence of evidence to the contrary, one must assume that outputs deposited in that server are preprints (submitted versions); (3) compliance to the REF policy via deposits in preprint servers is only possible if the output was deposited before publication.

8 Items to be referred to the Research Policy Committee

The following papers will be forwarded to the RPC:

- a) A copy of these minutes.
- b) Revised Research Data Management Policy Framework, once minor revisions have been completed.
- c) Terms of reference of the Plan S and Journal Coordination Working Group.

Next Meeting: Monday, 27 January 2020, 11:00–12:30
The Council Room, the Old Schools

Open Research Steering Committee Secretary:
André Sartori afs25@cam.ac.uk 01223 3 33065
Office of Scholarly Communication, University Library, Cambridge, CB3 9DR